DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 758 JC 880 314

AUTHOR Wright, Calvin E.; Kim, Yungho
TITLE Strengths and Needs for Improvement in Occupational Education Programs in California Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc., Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.; Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 87
CONTRACT 11-6-1154-18
NOTE 93p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Qualifications; Advisory Committees; *Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; *Educational Quality; Education Work Relationship; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; State Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Qualifications; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education; Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In fall 1984, the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges implemented a new statewide occupational education program evaluation and reporting system, using information supplied by occupational education administrators, instructors, and advisory committee members. To collect the evaluation data, the 106 California community colleges were divided into four representative groups and all occupational programs were divided into four clusters, with one cluster to be evaluated each year. Data on programs targeted for the 1983-84 evaluation were collected from 80 colleges in fall 1984, while data for 1984-85 were collected from 64 colleges in spring 1985. Over the 2-year period, usable responses were received from 376 administrators, 1,355 instructors, and 675 program advisory committee members, assessing 830 of the estimated 3,723 occupational programs offered at the community colleges. Major findings included the following: (1) occupational education administrators pointed to the qualifications of instructional staff and special provisions for reentry as strengths of occupational education in California, while the use of student follow-up information and the numbers of instructors were seen as two areas needing improvement; (2) occupational education instructors found the qualifications of instructional staff and administrators to be strengths, while provisions in the capital outlay budget and the use of support staff were considered the areas that most needed improvement; (3) over 85% of the local program advisory committee members felt that all instructors were competent to teach the subject and that program completers were able to perform successfully the duties required by employers; and (4) advisory committees perceived program needs in the areas of equipment and facility maintenance, safety standards, student follow-up, and labor market information. The administrator, instructor, and program advisory committee evaluation forms and detailed results are appended. (MDB)

86-459-09

ED296758

STRENGTHS AND NEEDS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Calvin E. Wright and Yungho Kim

Prepared for the
Vocational Education Division
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

January 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This report is made pursuant to contract number 11-6-154-18. This project was supported by Vocational Education Act of 1984 funds (Title II, Part B), P.L. 98-524, administered by the Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

JC 880 314

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The development and implementation of the California Community Colleges Occupational Education Program Evaluation System were carried out under the direction of the Statewide Coordination and Evaluation Advisory Committee. The following individuals served as members of the advisory committee in 1985-86.

Henry Gronroos, Chairperson
Associate Dean
Occupational Education
Santa Rosa Junior College

Jerry Barkley
Associate Dean
Vocational Education
Kings River Community College

Claire Biancalana
Dean of Instruction
Cabrillo College

M. J. Fujimoto
Assistant to the Chancellor
Educational Services Division
Los Angeles Community College District

Vernon Halcromb
Administrative Dean of
Occupational Education
Pasadena City College

Clinton Hamann
Director, Vocational Education
and Employment Training Services
San Diego Community College District

Jim Hirschinger
Associate Dean
Student Special Services
Sierra College

Kathy Lusk
Dean of Development
Rancho Santiago CCD

H. Dean McNeilly
Associate Dean
Vocational Education
San Joaquin Delta College

Gregory S. Ohanneson
Assistant Dean of Occupational
Education
San Jose City College

Frank Roberts
Dean of Technical Education
Antelope Valley College

Richard Whiteman
Dean of Vocational Education
and Projects
Cerritos College

Chadwick Woo, Jr., Assistant Dean
Handicapped Student Programs and
Services
Los Angeles City College

Richard Wright
Dean, Occupational Programs
Mt. San Antonio College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Objectives of the Statewide Program Evaluation System	1
Limitations of the Evaluation Findings	2
METHOD	3
Collect Evaluation Data	3
Process and Analyze Evaluation Data	3
Identify Program Strengths and Needs for Improvement	4
Prepare Statewide Evaluation Report	5
RESULTS	7
Occupational Education Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Administrators	7
Results by TOP discipline	7
Overall results for all disciplines	7
Results for special populations	7
Program Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Instructors	12
Results by statewide advisory committee areas	12
Overall results for all programs	12
Criteria rated by administrators and instructors	13
Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees	17
Results by statewide advisory committee areas	17
Overall results for all programs	17
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
Summary of Major Findings	31
Recommendations	32
APPENDICES	33
A. Administrator Evaluation Form	34
B. Instructor Evaluation Form	43
C. Program Advisory Committee Evaluation Form	54
D. Results from Occupational Education Administrator Evaluation Form	62
E. Results from Occupational Education Instructor Evaluation Form	64
F. Results from Occupational Education Program Advisory Committee Evaluation Form	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for TOP Disciplines As Perceived by Administrators	9
2	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Administrators: Overall Results for All Disciplines	11
3	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Instructors: Programs Grouped by Statewide Advisory Committees Areas	14
4	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Instructors: Overall Results for All Programs	16
5	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Agriculture/Natural Resources Area Programs (N=58)	19
6	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Distributive and Marketing Area Programs (N=89)	20
7	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Health Occupations Area Programs (N=110)	21
8	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Home Economics/Consumer Education Area Programs (N=62)	22
9	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Office Education/ Secretarial Studies Area Programs (N=71)	23
10	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Public Safety Area Programs (N=43)	25
11	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Technical Area Programs (N=79)	26
12	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Trade and Industry Area Programs (N=163)	27
13	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Overall Results for All Programs (N=675)	28

INTRODUCTION

Background

The evaluation of California Community Colleges occupational education programs was required by the 1976 Vocational Education Act (P.L. 94-482) and by the California State Plan for Vocational Education. To meet these evaluation requirements, the staff at the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office designed and implemented in 1978 a statewide occupational education program evaluation and reporting system, called the SAM/COPES Evaluation System.

In implementing the SAM/COPES Evaluation System, the 106 community colleges were divided into four representative groups and all occupational programs were divided into four clusters of programs. For a given year, colleges in a particular group implemented the evaluation system for only one cluster of programs. Thus, by the 1982-83 school year, which was the last year of a four-year evaluation cycle, all the community colleges completed the evaluation of all of their occupational programs.

Before starting a new evaluation cycle in 1983, the Chancellor's Office staff decided that a revision of the statewide evaluation system was needed to make it more relevant and efficient. The task of revising the system was given to a 16-member Chancellor's Office Occupational Education Advisory Committee for Evaluation and Research. Also, a contract was awarded to Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc., (EERI) to provide support services to this committee and the Chancellor's staff in order to facilitate the revision process. The new, modified evaluation system is called the Occupational Education Program Evaluation System.

There were some delays in the development of the instruments and procedures required for the modified evaluation system, and the system was not ready to go until the fall of 1984. Consequently, the system was implemented in the fall of 1984 to evaluate the occupational programs targeted for the 1983-84 evaluation. The programs targeted for the 1984-85 school year were evaluated in the spring of 1985 as originally scheduled. This report on program strengths and needs for improvement was prepared using data submitted by the colleges for 1983-84 and 1984-85.

Objectives of the Statewide Program Evaluation System

The objectives of the California Community Colleges Occupational

Education Program Evaluation System were to:

1. Satisfy state and federal evaluation requirements.
2. Obtain data for improving occupational programs statewide as well as at individual colleges.
3. Have data to respond to requests from the legislature and others.

To accomplish these objectives, the evaluation system required the collection of program data from three sources: occupational education administrators, instructors, and local program advisory committees. All occupational education programs in California community colleges were to be evaluated according to a four-year schedule. The same four college groups and four program clusters used in the previous SAM/COPES system were also used in the modified program evaluation system. Information resulting from this evaluation system was to be used by staff at the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, by the statewide advisory committees of program experts, and by Administrators of Occupational Education at individual community colleges in California.

Limitations of the Evaluation Findings

The following factors should be considered when reviewing the findings presented in this report.

1. The findings are based on data collected for the first two years of an originally planned four-year evaluation cycle.
2. Data were not available for a large number of the community colleges. No data were submitted by about 25% of colleges for the 1983-84 evaluation or by 40% of colleges for the 1984-85 evaluation.
3. For many individual programs, the number of colleges that reported evaluation data for a particular program was very small. Since data were collected for only two years of a four-year cycle and not all colleges responded, it is impossible to estimate how well the available evaluation data represent that particular program statewide.
4. The way that program strengths or needs for improvement were determined (i.e., by use of a given percentage as a cut-off point) dictated that when a program has a small number of program offerings statewide, it has a greater chance to have a large number of strengths as well as needs for improvement.

METHOD

The activities carried out to develop the instruments and procedures required for the California Community Colleges Occupational Education Program Education System were described in a previous report (Wright, C. E., & Kim, Y. Summary of Activities Performed to Provide Support Services Related to the Implementation of the California Community Colleges Occupational Education Program Evaluation System, 1985.) To implement the system for the 1983-84 and 1984-85 evaluations, three major tasks were completed. They were: collect data on the programs targeted for the 1983-84 and 1984-85 school years; process and analyze data; and prepare a statewide evaluation report. Each of these tasks is described below.

Collect Evaluation Data

Data were collected using the three evaluation forms shown in Appendices A, B, and C: Occupational Education Administrator Evaluation Form, Occupational Education Instructor Evaluation Form, and Occupational Education Program Advisory Committee Evaluation Form. Administrators filled out the form at a discipline level (e.g., Health), and instructors and advisory committees filled out the form at a 5-digit program level (e.g., Dental Assistant).

In order to collect evaluation data, the 106 community colleges were divided into four representative groups and all occupational programs were divided into four clusters of programs. The colleges were informed about their assigned clusters of programs for the four-year evaluation cycle starting in the 1983-84 school year. As mentioned before, because of delays in instrument development, the colleges were asked to submit evaluation data on programs targeted for the 1983-84 evaluation in the fall of 1984, instead of the spring of 1984. Evaluation data on programs targeted for the 1984-85 evaluation were collected in the spring of 1985 as originally scheduled. Eighty of the 106 colleges submitted their completed evaluation forms for the 1983-84 evaluation, while 64 colleges did so for the 1984-85 evaluation. Over the two evaluation years, usable forms were received from 376 administrators, 1,355 instructors, and 675 program advisory committees. These evaluation forms represent 830 programs among the estimated total of 3,723 programs offered at the community colleges.

Process and Analyze Evaluation Data

Evaluation forms received were edited and prepared for data processing.

All the comments on individual items as well as comments on program strengths and weaknesses were edited so that a comment did not exceed 80 characters. Both the comments and quantitative data were key entered and necessary computer files were created. The comments were used by the occupational education statewide advisory committees and the Chancellor's Office.

The evaluation data for 1983-84 and 1984-85 were combined for the analyses to obtain more reliable information because: each year covered only about one-fourth of the programs offered at a college; and a large number of the colleges did not submit the required data. The data were analyzed to meet various requests from the statewide advisory committees of program experts. Also, the data were analyzed to prepare a statewide evaluation report (this report) on the strengths and needs for improvement for occupational programs in California community colleges.

Identify Program Strengths and Needs for Improvement

For the preparation of this report, rating data on the administrator evaluation forms were tallied and appropriate percentages were computed by TOP discipline. Rating data on the instructor evaluation forms were also tallied and appropriate percentages were computed by 5-digit program as well as by the areas of the eight subject matter statewide advisory committees.

A set of criteria for identifying program strengths and needs for improvement was established by a team of evaluation specialists and occupational education experts. On the basis of the distribution of administrator and instructor ratings, a strength was defined as an item on the administrator or instructor evaluation form with an "Excellent" rating of 60% or greater. A need for improvement was defined as an item with a sum of "Very Poor" and "Poor" ratings of 20% or greater. These criteria were applied to each item on the administrator and instructor evaluation forms. Although these cut-points of 60% and 20% are arbitrary, the figures were chosen by the team of experts with a reasonable assurance that results do indeed indicate strengths and/or needs for improvement for a program.

Responses on the advisory committee forms were tallied and appropriate percentages were computed by 5-digit program as well as by the areas of the eight subject matter statewide advisory committees. A set of criteria for identifying program strengths and needs for improvement was established by the same team of experts mentioned above. The criteria for the advisory

committee data were more complex than those applied to the administrator and instructor rating data (see Appendix F for detail). These criteria were applied to the percentage of respondents checking the item on the advisory committee evaluation form. The specific cut-points used varied as a function of the wording of the item.

Prepare Statewide Evaluation Report

This evaluation report was prepared to focus on the strengths and weaknesses of occupational education programs in California community colleges. The report also includes a summary of findings and recommendations. The information contained in this report is intended for use by staff at the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, by the statewide advisory committees of program experts, and by Administrators of Occupational Education at individual community colleges in California.

RESULTS

The results of the evaluation are presented below for each type of respondent: occupational education administrators, instructors, and program advisory committees.

Occupational Education Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Administrators

As previously mentioned, the Occupational Education Administrator Evaluation Form (see Appendix A) requested ratings on 12 criteria for quality programs by TOP discipline. Results by TOP discipline are presented below, followed by overall results for all disciplines combined and results for criteria related to special needs populations.

Results by TOP discipline. Strengths and needs for improvement for TOP disciplines as perceived by administrators are shown in Table 1. The number of strengths for a TOP discipline ranged from one to seven (for Commercial Services) while there were either no needs for improvement or only one need for improvement. Qualifications of instructional staff was identified as a strength for 10 of the 11 TOP disciplines. Special provisions for reentry students was a strength for five disciplines. The only criterion identified as a need for program improvement was use of student follow-up information, which was the need for five of the 11 disciplines.

Overall results for all disciplines. Table 2 shows strengths and needs for improvement as perceived by administrators identified from results aggregated over all TOP disciplines. For this table the three criteria with the largest percent of "Excellent" ratings are identified as strengths and listed in rank order. Similarly, the three criteria with the largest percents of "Very Poor" and "Poor" ratings are identified as needs for improvement, and are also listed in rank order.

The criteria identified as strengths on the basis of ratings by administrators were: qualifications of instructional staff, special provisions for reentry students, and efforts to achieve gender equity. The needs for improvement were: use of student follow-up information, number of instructors, and emphasis on counseling and guidance.

Results for special populations. Six criteria rated by administrators related to the special needs populations. They were: special provisions for disadvantaged students, special provisions for handicapped students, special

provisions for reentry students, efforts to achieve gender equity, and emphasis on counseling and guidance.

No needs for improvement were identified for these criteria. The sums of "Very Poor" and "Poor" ratings were generally low and often zero. The largest sum was 16% for Business and Management on emphasis on counseling and guidance.

Special provisions for disadvantaged students was identified as a strength ("Excellent" rating of 60% or greater) for Public Affairs and Services and for Communications. The "Excellent" rating was above 50% for four other disciplines. It was lowest for Health (38%).

Special provisions for handicapped students was a strength for one discipline, Business and Management. Five other disciplines had an "Excellent" rating of 50% or greater. It was lowest for Agriculture and Natural Resources (32%) and for Health (31%).

Special provisions for reentry students was identified as a strength for five disciplines: Commercial Services, Architecture and Environmental Design, Consumer Education and Home Economics, Public Affairs and Services, and Communications. The rating of "Excellent" was above 50% for three other disciplines. The lowest rating of "Excellent" was for Agriculture and Natural Resources (39%).

Considering efforts to achieve gender equity, this criteria was identified as a strength for Communications, Public Affairs and Services, and Computer and Information Science. There were five other disciplines where the percent of "Excellent" ratings was over 50%. The lowest rating of "Excellent," 28%, was for Consumer Education and Home Economics.

The last criterion related to the special needs populations was emphasis on counseling and guidance. It was not identified as a strength for any discipline. However, two disciplines had "Excellent" ratings of 50% or greater: Architecture and Environmental Design, and Fine and Applied Arts. The lowest percent of "Excellent" rating was 13% for Consumer Education and Home Economics.

Table 1

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for TOP Disciplines
as Perceived by Administrators

Agriculture and Natural Resources (N=22)

Strength

1. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

1. Use of student follow-up information

Architecture and Environmental Design (N=7)

Strengths

1. Special provisions for reentry students
2. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

None identified

Business and Management (N=40)

Strengths

1. Special provisions for handicapped students
2. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

1. Use of student follow-up information

Communications (N=5)

Strengths

1. Special provisions for disadvantaged students
2. Special provisions for reentry students
3. Efforts to achieve gender equity
4. Program availability and accessibility
5. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

None identified

Computer and Information Science (N=28)

Strength

1. Efforts to achieve gender equity

Need for Improvement

1. Use of student follow-up information

(Table continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for TOP Disciplines
as Perceived by Administrators

Engineering and Related Technologies (N=35)

Strength

1. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

None identified

Fine and Applied Arts (N=11)

Strength

1. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

1. Use of student follow-up information

Health (N=34)

Strengths

1. Use of occupational education goals
2. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

None identified

Consumer Education and Home Economics (N=27)

Strengths

1. Special provisions for reentry students
2. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

1. Use of student follow-up information

Public Affairs and Services (N=27)

Strengths

1. Special provisions for disadvantaged students
2. Special provisions for reentry students
3. Efforts to achieve gender equity
4. Program availability and accessibility
5. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

1. Use of student follow-up information

(Table continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for TOP Disciplines
as Perceived by Administrators

Commercial Services (N=11)

Strengths

1. Use of occupational education goals
2. Coordination with other community programs and services
3. Special provisions for reentry students
4. Program availability and accessibility
5. Promotion of occupational education as a vital college function
6. Number of instructors
7. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

None identified

Note. See Appendix Table D-1 for the number of colleges offering programs in each discipline. A strength was identified when 60% or more of the respondents rated a criterion as "Excellent." A need for improvement was identified when 20% or more of the respondents rated a criterion as "Very Poor or "Poor."

Table 2

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Administrators:
Overall Results for All Disciplines

Strengths

1. Qualifications of instructional staff
2. Special provisions for reentry students
3. Efforts to achieve gender equity

Needs for Improvement

1. Use of student follow-up information
2. Number of instructors
3. Emphasis on counseling and guidance

Note. Based on aggregated data for 247 disciplines reported among 900 offered statewide. The strengths and needs are rank-ordered, with the greatest first.

Program Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Instructors

Twenty-two criteria for quality programs were rated by instructors using the Occupational Education Instructor Evaluation Form (Appendix B.) The 22 criteria are listed in Appendix Table E-1. While the administrators rated occupational disciplines, the instructors rated individual occupational education programs. For analysis purposes, these programs were grouped into the areas of the eight subject-matter statewide advisory committees. The results by individual program are shown in Appendix Tables E-2 through E-9. Results aggregated by the areas of the statewide advisory committees are presented below, followed by overall results for all programs. Criteria rated by both administrators and instructors are then presented.

Results by statewide advisory committee areas. Strengths and needs for improvement as perceived by instructors are shown in Table 3 for occupational programs grouped by the subject areas of the statewide advisory committees. The number of strengths for a subject area ranged from none (for Office Education/Secretarial Studies) to seven (for Health Occupations). Qualifications of instructional staff was identified as a strength for seven of the eight areas. Qualifications of administrators and/or supervisors was a strength for four. The number of needs for improvement for a subject area ranged from none (for Health Occupations) to four (for Distributive and Marketing, Public Safety, and Technical). Provisions in capital outlay budget was a need for six of the eight areas, use of support staff was a need for five, and inservice education opportunities a need for four areas.

Overall results for all programs. Table 4 shows strengths and needs for improvement as perceived by instructors identified from results aggregated over all programs. The three criteria with the largest percent of "Excellent" ratings were identified as strengths and are listed in the table in rank order. The three criteria with the largest percent of "Very Poor" and "Poor" ratings were identified as needs for improvement. They are also listed in rank order in the table.

The criteria identified as strengths on the basis of ratings by instructors were: qualifications of instructional staff, qualifications of administrators and/or supervisors, and use of measurable performance objectives. The needs for improvement were: provisions in capital outlay

budget, use of support staff, and provisions in current operating budget.

Criteria rated by administrators and instructors. Two criteria for quality programs were rated by both administrators and instructors. They were number of instructors, and qualifications of instructional staff. Administrators rated number of instructors "Excellent" more than instructors did in all disciplines except Business and Management, Engineering and Related Technologies, and Consumer Education and Home Economics. For Commercial Services, the administrator rating of number of instructors was identified as a strength.

Administrators usually rated the qualifications of instructional staff "Excellent" more frequently than the instructors did. However, in Communications and in Agriculture and Natural Resources the instructors rated it "Excellent" considerably more often that the administrators did. Qualifications of instructional staff was identified as a strength as perceived by both administrators and instructors in all disciplines except for Computer and Information Science.

Table 3

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Instructors: Programs Grouped by Statewide Advisory Committees Areas

Agriculture/Natural Resources (N=59)

Strength

1. Qualifications of instructional staff

Needs for Improvement

1. Coordination of placement of occupational education students
2. Inservice education opportunities
3. Provisions in capital outlay budget

Distributive and Marketing (N=108)

Strengths

1. Qualifications of administrators and/or supervisors
2. Qualifications of instructional staff

Needs for Improvement

1. Inservice education opportunities
2. Use of support staff
3. Provisions in current operating budget
4. Provisions in capital outlay budget

Health Occupations (N=125)

Strengths

1. Use of measurable learner performance objectives
2. Use of information on job performance requirements and industry standards
3. Relevance of major-related courses
4. Provision for work experience
5. Placement effectiveness for students trained with marketable skills
6. Qualifications of administrators and/or supervisors
7. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

None identified

Home Economics/Consumer Education (N=73)

Strengths

1. Provision for work experience
2. Qualifications of administrators and/or supervisors
3. Qualifications of instructional staff

Need for Improvement

1. Use of support staff

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 3 (continued)

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Instructors: Programs Grouped by Statewide Advisory Committees Areas

Office Education/Secretarial Studies (N=88)

Strength

None identified

Need for Improvement

1. Provision in capital outlay budget

Public Safety (N=40)

Strengths

1. Qualifications of administrators and/or supervisors
2. Qualifications of instructional staff

Needs for Improvement

1. Inservice education opportunities
2. Use of support staff
3. Provisions in current operating budget
4. Provisions in capital outlay budget

Technical (N=110)

Strength

1. Qualifications of instructional staff

Needs for Improvement

1. Inservice education opportunities
2. Use of support staff
3. Provisions in current operating budget
4. Provisions in capital outlay budget

Trade and Industry (N=227)

Strength

1. Qualifications of instructional staff

Needs for Improvement

1. Use of support staff
2. Provisions in capital outlay budget

Note. See Appendix E for lists of which programs were considered for each committee. See Appendix Table E-10 for the number of programs offered in each committee area. A strength was identified when 60% or more of the respondents rated a criterion as "Excellent." A need for improvement was identified when 20% or more of the respondents rated a criterion as "Very Poor" or "Poor."

Table 4

Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Instructors: Overall Results for All Programs

Strengths
Qualifications of instructional staff
Qualifications of administrators and/or supervisors
Use of measurable learner performance objectives
Needs for Improvement
Provisions in capital outlay budget
Use of support staff
Provisions in current operating budget

Note. Based on aggregated data for 830 programs reported from among 3,723 offered. The strengths and needs are rank-ordered, with the greatest first.

Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Program Advisory Committees

The Occupational Education Program Advisory Committee Evaluation Form (see Appendix C) was filled out for individual occupational education programs. The form contained 10 major items each with three to seven subitems for a total of 52 items. For most of the major items it was logically possible to check multiple subitems. From the 52, 25 items were selected for use in the analyses. These were the items that it appeared could be used as criteria for quality programs after eliminating redundancies (such as a "No" item for which there was also a "Yes"). The items selected are shown in Appendix Table F-1. For analysis purposes the occupational education programs were grouped into the areas of the eight subject-matter statewide advisory committees, as was done for the instructor data. The results by individual programs are shown in Appendix Tables F-2 through F-9. Results by statewide advisory committee areas are presented below, as are overall results for all programs.

Results by statewide advisory committee areas. Strengths and needs for improvement as perceived by program advisory committees are shown in Tables 5 through 12 for programs grouped by statewide advisory committee areas. (See Appendix F for which programs were considered for each area.) The number of strengths identified for an area ranged from 11 (for Trade and Industry) to 14 (for Health Occupations). Eleven items were identified as strengths in all eight committee areas, while one was identified as a strength in seven of the areas. The number of needs for improvement for an area ranged from two (for Health Occupations, Technical, and Trade and Industry) to four (for Home Economics/Consumer Education and for Office Education/Secretarial Studies). Two items were identified as needs for all eight areas. The first was: the equipment and facilities for the program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards. (This item was considered a need if it was not 100% for a program.) The second was: considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained for this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

Overall results for all programs. Table 13 shows strengths and needs for improvement as perceived by program advisory committees identified from results aggregated over all programs. All items identified through the use

of the cut-points are included. The strengths and needs are listed order, with the greatest first. The greatest strength was: this pro does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area is designed to serve, or it duplicated but serves persons who would not otherwise be served. The 11 other strengths address a number of topics. The greatest needs for improvement was: the equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards. The other two needs had to do with the lack of local labor market surveys to support employment demand, and the lack of follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program.

Table 5

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Agriculture/Natural Resources Area Programs (N=58)

Strengths

1. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
2. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.
3. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are adequate to provide a quality program.
4. The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
5. The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
6. The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.
7. The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.
8. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.
9. The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.
10. This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
11. All of the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.
12. All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.

Needs for Improvement

1. The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.
2. Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) have been reviewed and discussed by the committee.
3. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

Table 6

Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Distributive and Marketing Area Programs (N=89)

Strengths

1. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
2. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.
3. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are adequate to provide a quality program.
4. The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
5. The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
6. The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.
7. The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.
8. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.
9. The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.
10. This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
11. All of the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.
12. All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.

Needs for Improvement

1. The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.
2. Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) have been reviewed and discussed by the committee.
3. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

Table 7

Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Health Occupations Area Programs (N=110)

Strengths

1. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
2. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.
3. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are adequate to provide a quality program.
4. The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
5. The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
6. The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.
7. The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.
8. Follow-up data about the number of students who complete the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) are not available.
9. Follow-up data about the number of students who complete the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) appear to justify continuing the program, in the opinion of the committee.
10. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.
11. The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.
12. This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
13. All of the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.
14. All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.

Needs for Improvement

1. The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 7 (continued)

Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Health Occupations Area Programs (N=110)

2.	Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

Table 8

Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Home Economics/Consumer Education Area Programs (N=62)

Strengths	
1.	The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
2.	The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.
3.	The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are adequate to provide a quality program.
4.	The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
5.	The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
6.	The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.
7.	The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.
8.	Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.
9.	The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.
10.	This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
11.	All of the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 8 (continued)

Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Home Economics/Consumer Education Area Programs (N=62)

12. All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.

Needs for Improvement

1. The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.
2. Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) have been reviewed and discussed by the committee.
3. Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) appear to justify continuing the program, in the opinion of the advisory committee.
4. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

Table 9

Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Office Education/Secretarial Studies Area Programs (N=71)

Strengths

1. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
2. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.
3. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are adequate to provide a quality program.
4. The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
5. The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
6. The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 9 (continued)

Strengths and Needs for Improvement as Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Office Education/Secretarial Studies Area Programs (N=71)

7. The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.

8. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.

9. The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.

10. This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.

11. All of the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.

12. All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.

Needs for Improvement

1. The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.

2. Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) have been reviewed and discussed by the committee.

3. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

4. All of the instructors in this program have had recent inservice training opportunities sufficient to meet their needs.

Table 10

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Public Safety Area Programs (N=43)

Strengths

1. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
2. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.
3. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are adequate to provide a quality program.
4. The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
5. The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
6. The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.
7. The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.
8. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.
9. The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.
10. This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
11. All of the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.
12. All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.

Needs for Improvement

1. The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.
2. Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) have been reviewed and discussed by the committee.
3. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

Table 11

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Technical Area Programs (N=79)

Strengths

1. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
2. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.
3. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are adequate to provide a quality program.
4. The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
5. The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
6. The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.
7. The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.
8. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.
9. The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.
10. This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
11. All of the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.
12. All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.
13. All of the instructors in this program possess recent employment experience related to the program.

Needs for Improvement

1. The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.
2. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

Table 12

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Trade and Industry Area Programs (N=163)

Strengths

1. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
2. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.
3. The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
4. The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
5. The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.
6. The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.
7. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.
8. The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.
9. This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
10. All of the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.
11. All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.

Needs for Improvement

1. The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.
2. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

Table 13

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Overall Results for All Programs (N = 675)

Strengths

1. This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
2. All the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.
3. The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.
4. The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.
5. The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
6. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
7. The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
8. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skills development matching industry job specifications.
9. The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.
10. All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.
11. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.
12. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are adequate to provide a quality program.

Needs for Improvement

1. The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.[a]
2. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.

(Table continued on next page)

Table 13

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Program Advisory Committees: Overall Results for All Programs

3. Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) have been reviewed and discussed by the committee.	

Note. Based on aggregated data for 675 programs reported from among 3,723 offered. The strengths and need are rank-ordered, with the greatest first.

[a]This item was considered a need if it was not 100% for a program.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Major Findings

Eighty of the 106 California community colleges submitted completed evaluation forms for 1983-84, while 64 colleges did so for 1984-85. Over the two years, usable forms were received from 376 administrators, 1,355 instructors, and 675 program advisory committees. These evaluation forms represented 830 programs among the estimated total of 3,723 programs offered at the community colleges. The major findings from the detailed analysis of data from administrators, instructors, and local program advisory committees are as follows:

1. Occupational education administrators believed that the qualifications of instructional staff and the special provisions for reentry students are strengths of occupational education in California community colleges, while the use of student follow-up information and the number of instructors are two areas needing improvement.

2. Occupational education administrators felt that special services and support that colleges provide for special needs students are excellent for many occupational disciplines.

3. Occupational education instructors believed that the qualifications of instructional staff and the qualifications of administrators and/or supervisors are program strengths, while provisions in the capital outlay budget and the use of support staff are the areas that need most improvement.

4. Administrators were generally more positive than instructors in their evaluation of the adequacy of the number of instructors as well as in the qualifications of the instructional staff.

5. Most local program advisory committees (over 85%) believed that: their program does not unnecessarily duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area; all instructors in the program have occupational competency to teach the subject; and program completers are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.

6. Local program advisory committee data indicated that: equipment and facilities need to be maintained to meet acceptable safety

standards; student follow-up data need to be reviewed by the advisory committees; and employment demand information should be supported by a local labor market survey.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the statewide occupational education advisory committees review the information on programs contained in this report and, on the basis of their expert judgment, prioritize the needs for program improvement in reports to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office. The information should also be used in preparing recommendations for special statewide projects for program improvement.

2. It is recommended that the Chancellor's Office, while recognizing the limitations of the data analyzed for this report, utilize the information provided here to set policies for improving occupational programs statewide until more complete data become available. The information should also be used in preparing accountability reports and reports for other audiences.

3. It is also recommended that Administrators of Occupational Education at the community colleges review the statewide data for individual occupational programs to assess the relative status of their own local programs and to identify potential needs for improvement.

4. In addition, it is recommended that the evaluation forms and process used in the Occupational Education Program Evaluation System be modified to obtain more specific information needed at the local and statewide levels for program improvement as well as to improve the college response rate.

APPENDICES

FORM 1
Revised
9/7/84

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
PROGRAM EVALUATION SYSTEM

Occupational Education Administrator Evaluation Form

TOP DISCIPLINE (Check one only.)

__01: Ag & Natural Res.	__07: Computer & IS	__12: Health
__02: Arch. & Env. Design	__09: Engineering & Related Tech.	__13: Consumer Ed & HE
__05: Business and Mgmt.		__21: Pub. Affairs & Svcs
__06: Communications	__10: Fine and Appl. Arts	__30: Commercial Services

COLLEGE _____ DATE _____

Background Information

The primary purpose of evaluating occupational education programs and services in the California community college system is to provide a basis for appropriate statewide change and/or program improvement. In addition, evaluation is mandated by both the state and federal governments, and consequently, it is needed for compliance purposes. It is also needed to address the greater responsibility called accountability.

Accountability of occupational education is assumed to encompass such ideas as being responsible, answerable, and accountable for the status, condition, quality or facts about the functions and activities involved. Fiscal accountability will be accomplished by an administrative review of programs called PAR, and by an audit process in which colleges participate periodically. Statewide program accountability will be accomplished by several evaluation practices. All occupational education programs in California community colleges will be evaluated according to a four-year statewide schedule. However, some colleges may choose to conduct additional or more frequent evaluations to meet local district needs.

Use of Evaluation Data

The information you provide by completing the attached evaluation form is to be held, along with evaluations of individual programs in this TOP discipline, in an accountability file at your college or district offices. As you may know, instructors and advisory committee members are completing separate evaluations of the individual programs. Information in the accountability file is intended to be used in the accreditation self-study process in addition to its statewide uses. The state Chancellor's Office will periodically collect from colleges on a sample basis data on occupational education programs. The Chancellor's Office will prepare the data for a statewide committee of program experts to study, to validate, and to recommend action to be taken by the Chancellor's Office. The

committee report will be distributed to all colleges. The report will be included in the annual statewide accountability report which will be disseminated to appropriate state and federal agencies for accountability purposes. Selected committees of the Legislature will also have access to the report. In addition, the statewide committee responsible for generating the report will participate in developing recommendations regarding priorities for the use of Vocational Education Act program improvement funds.

Instructions for Administrators of Occupational Education

Administrators of occupational education are requested to rate the following items for the occupational education programs in the TOP discipline identified at the beginning of this form. The items you are asked to rate are considered criteria for quality programs. The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college is meeting each criterion. They should also reflect a level of performance in terms of what should ideally occur at your college in providing instruction and services to students in occupational programs in this TOP discipline.

The five-point scale is designed to indicate high and low ratings. Definitions for EXCELLENT and VERY POOR ratings are provided for each criterion. EXCELLENT is a nearly ideal or exemplary situation; VERY POOR one of serious inadequacy. Intermediate ratings (GOOD, BORDERLINE, POOR) may be assigned with those two extremes in mind. The DON'T KNOW column should be used if you are not knowledgeable about performance on the criterion or are not sufficiently involved to make a fair judgment. The comment column should be used to clarify ratings or omissions in ratings if necessary.

The last page of this document is for identifying strengths and weaknesses of the occupational programs in the TOP discipline and for making recommendations for program improvement. Your are requested to sign the last page.

It should be noted that this form is intended to help identify areas of strength and needs for improvement of the occupational education programs in the TOP discipline. These self-ratings are not intended to be used, nor should they be used, to compare your programs with similar programs at other colleges. Your ratings for each criterion can be used by your local program experts to determine program strengths and needs for improvement. When analyzed with similar information about programs at a number of other colleges, the ratings will help identify potential strengths and needs for program improvement statewide.

FORM 1
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
1 USE OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS Excellent: Occupational education goals, clearly stated in writing, are consistently used as a basis for planning specific objectives for occupational programs in this TOP discipline. Very Poor: Occupational goals are rarely considered in planning objectives for occupational programs in this TOP discipline.							
2 USE OF STUDENT FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION Excellent: Current follow-up data on completers and leavers with marketable skills are consistently and systematically used in the evaluation of occupational programs in this TOP discipline. Very Poor: Student follow-up information has not been collected and used in the evaluation of programs in this TOP discipline.							
3 COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMUNITY PROGRAMS AND AGENCIES Excellent: Effective liaison is maintained with other community programs and agencies (such as high schools, other community colleges, regional occupational programs and centers) to assure a coordinated approach and avoid duplication in meeting occupational needs in the geographic area programs this TOP discipline are designed to serve. Very Poor: College activities reflect a disinterest in coordination with other community programs and agencies having impact on occupational programs in this TOP discipline.							

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
4 SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS Excellent: Special services with qualified staff are provided by the college for students with academic, socioeconomic, cultural, and related disadvantages such as limited or non-English speaking ability. In addition, such services are readily available to students in occupational programs in this TOP discipline and they are coordinated with occupational instruction. Very Poor: Almost no special services are provided for disadvantaged students in occupational programs in this TOP discipline.							
5 SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR HANDICAPPED STUDENTS Excellent: Special services with qualified staff are provided by the college for students with physical, mental, emotional, and other health-impairing handicaps. In addition, such services are readily available to students in occupational programs in this TOP discipline and they are coordinated with occupational instruction. Program facilities and equipment are also adapted to meet student needs. Very Poor: Special services for handicapped students in occupational programs in this TOP discipline are almost nonexistent, as are facility and equipment modifications.							

FORM 1
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
6 SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR REENTRY STUDENTS Excellent: Support services and remedial programs with qualified staff are provided by the college to help reentry students (such as displaced homemakers) succeed in occupational programs. In addition, such services are readily available to students in this TOP discipline and they are coordinated with occupational instruction. Very Poor: Almost no special services are provided or attention given by the college to reentry students in occupational programs in this TOP discipline.							
7 EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE SEX EQUITY Excellent: Emphasis is given to eliminating sex bias and sex stereotyping in programs in this TOP discipline: staffing, student recruitment, counseling and guidance, access to and acceptance in programs, selection of curricular materials, instruction, job development, and placement. Very Poor: Almost no attention is directed toward achieving sex equity in occupational programs in this TOP discipline.							

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
8 EMPHASIS ON COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE Excellent: The college provides an adequate number of personnel to assure that day, evening, and weekend students in occupational programs in this TOP discipline have ready access to career counseling and guidance and to program advisement. The counseling staff have current knowledge about occupational programs and use a variety of resources such as teachers, printed materials, and audiovisuals to meet individual student interests. Very Poor: Counseling staff are insufficient in number, and most have little proficiency in counseling related to occupational programs in this TOP discipline. Counseling services are available only during limited hours of the day and week.							
9 PROGRAM AVAILABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY Excellent: Students and potential students desiring enrollment in occupational programs in this TOP discipline are identified through recruitment activities, counseled on employment opportunities, afforded equitable treatment on enrollment selection, and not discouraged by unrealistic prerequisites. In addition, programs are readily available and accessible at convenient times and locations. Very Poor: Occupational programs in this TOP discipline are not available or accessible to most students seeking enrollment, and discriminatory selection procedures are practiced.							

FORM 1
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
10 PROMOTION OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AS A VITAL COLLEGE FUNCTION Excellent: An active and organized effort is made to inform the public and its representatives (such as news media, legislators, boards, the business community) of the importance of providing effective and comprehensive occupation education and to gain community support and contributions for programs in this TOP discipline. Very Poor: There is no organized public information effort for occupational education nor efforts to gain community support and contributions for programs in this TOP discipline.							
11 NUMBER OF INSTRUCTORS Excellent: Instructional staffing in occupational programs in this TOP discipline is sufficient to permit optimum program effectiveness (such as through enabling teachers to meet individual student needs, providing liaison with advisory committees, and conducting placement and follow-up activities). Very Poor: Staffing in occupational programs in this TOP discipline is inadequate to effectively meet the needs of the programs.							

FORM 1
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
12 QUALIFICATIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF Excellent: All of the instructors in occupational programs in this TOP discipline have two or more years of relevant employment experience, have kept current in their field, and have developed and maintained a high level of teaching competence. Very Poor: Few of the instructors in occupational programs in this TOP discipline have relevant employment experience or current competence in their field. Some do not meet the minimum qualifications in the California State Plan for Vocational Education.							

FORM 1
Revised
9/7/84

Please answer the following questions. Use extra sheets if necessary.

1. In your opinion, what are the chief strengths of the occupational education programs in this TOP discipline?

2. In your opinion, what major improvements, if any, are needed for occupational education programs in this TOP discipline, and what action is required to achieve these improvements?

Person completing this form:

Name _____ Title _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix B

FORM 2
Revised
9/7/84

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
PROGRAM EVALUATION SYSTEM

Occupational Education Instructor Evaluation Form

NAME OF PROGRAM _____ TOP CODE _____

COLLEGE _____ DATE _____

Background Information

The primary purpose of evaluating occupational education programs and services in the California community college system is to provide a basis for appropriate statewide change and/or program improvement. In addition, evaluation is mandated by both the state and federal governments, and consequently it is necessary for compliance purposes. Evaluation is also needed to address the greater responsibility called accountability.

Accountability of occupational education is assumed to encompass such ideas as being responsible, answerable, and accountable for the status, condition, quality, or facts about the functions and activities involved. Fiscal accountability will be accomplished by an administrative review of programs called PAR, and by an audit process in which colleges participate periodically. Statewide program accountability is to be accomplished by several evaluation practices. All occupational education programs in California community colleges will be evaluated following a four-year statewide schedule. However, some colleges may choose to conduct additional or more frequent evaluations to meet local district needs.

Use of Evaluation Data

The information you provide by completing the attached evaluation form is to be held, along with other evaluations of this occupational education program, in an accountability file at your college or district offices. As you may know, administrators and advisory committee members are completing separate evaluations of the program. Information in the accountability file is intended to be used in the accreditation self-study process in addition to its statewide uses. The state Chancellor's Office will periodically collect from colleges on a sample basis data on occupational education programs. The Chancellor's Office will prepare the data for a statewide committee of program experts to study, to validate, and to recommend action to be taken by the Chancellor's Office. The committee report will be distributed to all colleges. The report will be included in an annual statewide accountability report which will be disseminated to appropriate state and federal agencies for accountability purposes. Selected committees of the Legislature will have access to the information. In addition, the statewide committee responsible for generating the report will participate in developing recommendations regarding priorities for the use of Vocational Education Act program improvement funds.

Instructions for Instructors of Occupational Education Programs

Individual instructors of occupational education are requested to rate the following items for the occupational education program identified at the beginning of this form. The items you are asked to rate are considered criteria for quality programs. The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college or program is meeting each criterion. They should also reflect a level of performance in terms of what should ideally occur at your college in providing instruction and services to students in this occupational program.

The five-point scale is designed to indicate high and low ratings. Definitions for EXCELLENT and VERY POOR ratings are provided for each criterion. EXCELLENT is a nearly ideal or exemplary situation; VERY POOR one of serious inadequacy. Intermediate ratings (GOOD, BORDERLINE, POOR) may be assigned with those two extremes in mind. The DON'T KNOW column should be used if you are not knowledgeable about performance on the criterion or are not sufficiently involved to make a fair judgment. The comment column should be used to clarify ratings or omissions in ratings if necessary.

The last page of this document is for identifying strengths and weaknesses of the occupational program and for making recommendations for program improvement. You are requested to sign the last page.

It should be noted that this form is intended to help identify areas of strength and needs for improvement of the occupational education program. These self-ratings are not intended to be used, nor should they be used, to compare your program with similar programs at other colleges. Your ratings for each criterion can be used by your local program experts to determine program strengths and needs for improvement. When analyzed with similar information about programs at a number of other colleges, the ratings will help identify potential strengths and needs for program improvement statewide.

FORM 2
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college or program is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	1 VERY POOR	2 POOR	3 BORDERLINE	4 GOOD	5 EXCELLENT	6 DON'T KNOW	COMMENTS
1 USE OF MEASURABLE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES Excellent: Evaluation of this occupational program is based on written objectives stated in measurable terms (such as planned enrollments, completions, placements, etc.). Very Poor: No written objectives stated in measurable terms exist for this occupational program.							
2 USE OF MEASURABLE LEARNER PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES Excellent: Learner performance objectives are stated in writing and in measurable terms, and are used to evaluate student progress in almost all courses in this occupational program. These learner objectives are based on employment standards. Very Poor: No course in this occupational program has written learner performance objectives stated in measurable terms.							
3 USE OF INFORMATION ON LABOR MARKET AND COMMUNITY TRAINING NEEDS Excellent: Current data on labor market needs, community training needs, and emerging trends in job openings are systematically used in the development and evaluation of this occupational program. Very Poor: Labor market and community training needs data are not collected and used in the development or evaluation of this occupational program.							

FORM 2
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college or program is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	1	2	3	4	5	6	COMMENTS
4 USE OF INFORMATION ON JOB PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS AND INDUSTRY STANDARDS Excellent: Current data on job performance requirements and on industry standards are systematically used in the development and evaluation of both this program and the content of its courses. Very Poor: Job performance requirements and industry standards information are not collected and used in the development or evaluation of this program or its courses.							
5 ADAPTATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES Excellent: Instructional approaches in all courses in this program recognize and respond to individual student differences through such means as programmed learning, self-paced and small-group instruction, and bilingual assistance. Very Poor: Instructional approaches do not consider individual student differences in any courses in this program.							
6 RELEVANCE OF MAJOR-RELATED COURSES Excellent: Applicable major-related courses (such as anatomy and physiology, business and technical mathematics) are closely coordinated with this occupational program and are kept relevant and current to the needs of occupational students. Very Poor: Major-related course content reflects no planned approach to meeting the needs of students in this occupational program.							

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college or program is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
7 PROVISION FOR WORK EXPERIENCE Excellent: Ample opportunities are provided wherever possible for related work experience or equivalent clinical experience for students in this occupational program. Such student participation is well coordinated with classroom instruction and employer supervision. Very Poor: Few opportunities are provided in this occupational program for related work experience or equivalent clinical experience where such participation is possible.							
8 COORDINATION OF PLACEMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS Excellent: The college has an effectively functioning system for locating jobs and coordinating placement for students completing this occupational program. Very Poor: The college has no system or an ineffective system for locating jobs and coordinating placement for students completing this occupational program.							
9 PLACEMENT EFFECTIVENESS FOR STUDENTS TRAINED WITH MARKETABLE SKILLS Excellent: Program completers and leavers with marketable skills who desire employment are employed within a reasonable period of time in their field of preparation or in a closely related field. Very Poor: Few students completing this occupational program and desiring employment are placed in their field of preparation or a closely-related field.							

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college or program is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
10 PROVISION FOR DIRECTION AND COORDINATION Excellent: Responsibility, authority, and accountability for this occupational program are clearly identified and assigned. Also, sufficient administrative and/or supervisory time is provided to obtain maximum effectiveness in program planning, management, and evaluation. Very Poor: There are no clearly defined lines of responsibility, authority, and accountability for this occupational program.							
11 QUALIFICATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS AND/OR SUPERVISORS Excellent: Persons responsible for direction and coordination affecting this occupational program demonstrate a high level of administrative ability. In addition, they are knowledgeable in and committed to occupational education. Very Poor: Persons responsible for direction and coordination affecting this occupational program have little administrative ability and are not knowledgeable in and committed to occupational education.							
12 NUMBER OF INSTRUCTORS Excellent: Instructional staffing in this occupational program is sufficient to permit optimum program effectiveness (such as through enabling teachers to meet individual student needs, providing liaison with advisory committees, and conducting placement and follow-up activities). Very Poor: Staffing in this occupational program is inadequate to effectively meet the needs of the program.							

FORM 2
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college or program is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
13 QUALIFICATIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF Excellent: All of the instructors in this occupational program have two or more years of relevant employment experience, have kept current in their field, and have developed and maintained a high level of teaching competence. Very Poor: Few of the instructors in this occupational program have relevant employment experience or current competence in their field.							
14 INSERVICE EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES Excellent: The college encourages the continuing inservice growth of faculty in this occupational program through such opportunities as conference attendance, curriculum development, and work experience. In addition, this policy is supported with time and money. Very Poor: The college does not encourage the inservice growth of faculty in this occupational program. In addition, funds are not available to support opportunities for faculty inservice training.							
15 USE OF SUPPORT STAFF Excellent: Paraprofessionals (such as instructional aides and teacher assistants) and other support personnel are used when needed to ensure the maximum effectiveness of instructors in this occupational program. Very Poor: Support personnel are not used when needed to ensure the maximum effectiveness of instructors in this occupational program.							

FORM 2
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college or program is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
16 ADEQUACY AND AVAILABILITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT Excellent: Equipment used on or off campus for this occupational program is representative of that used in jobs for which students are being trained. In addition, it is current, operational, sufficient in amount, and safe. Very Poor: Equipment for this occupational program is outmoded or in unsatisfactory condition.							
17 ADEQUACY OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITIES Excellent: Instructional facilities (excluding equipment) meet program and student needs, are functional, and provide maximum flexibility and safe working conditions. Very Poor: Facilities for this occupational program are restrictive, dysfunctional, or overcrowded.							
18 USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT Excellent: Scheduling of facilities and equipment for this program on campus or off is planned to maximize use and allow quality instruction. Very Poor: Facilities and equipment for this program are significantly under- or over-scheduled and do not allow quality instruction.							

FORM 2
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college or program is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
19 ADEQUACY AND AVAILABILITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND LIBRARY RESOURCES Excellent: Instructional materials (such as textbooks, reference books, visual aids, mock-ups) are sufficient in quantity, current, relevant to this program and student needs, and varied. Very Poor: Materials in this occupational program are outdated, limited to basic textbooks, and lack relevance to program and student needs.							
20 USE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE Excellent: The advisory committee members for this occupational program are representative of the occupation and are actively used by college staff in appropriate activities (such as community needs analysis, program modification, and program promotion). In addition, the committee meets at least annually. Very Poor: Advisory committee members for this occupational program are not representative, are relegated largely to a passive role, and meet less often than annually.							
21 PROVISIONS IN CURRENT OPERATING BUDGET Excellent: Adequate funds are allocated in the college operating budget to support the achievement of approved program objectives and are planned with instructor input. Effective use is also made of outside funding sources. Very Poor: Funds provided are seriously inadequate in relation to approved objectives for this occupational program.							

FORM 2
Revised
9/7/84

The ratings should reflect your perception of how well the college or program is meeting each criterion.

CRITERIA FOR QUALITY PROGRAMS	VERY POOR 1	POOR 2	BORDERLINE 3	GOOD 4	EXCELLENT 5	DON'T KNOW 6	COMMENTS
22 PROVISIONS IN CAPITAL OUTLAY BUDGET Excellent: Adequate funds are allocated in a planned effort to provide for needed new facilities and equipment and for equipment replacement, repair, and renovation, consistent with the objectives for this occupational program. Also, instructor input is part of the planning process. Very Poor: Facilities and equipment needs for this occupational program are almost totally unmet in the capital outlay budget.							

FORM 2
Revised
9/7/84

Please answer the following questions. Use extra sheets if necessary.

1. In your opinion, what are the chief strengths of this occupational education program?

2. In your opinion, what major improvements, if any, are needed for this occupational education program and what action is required to achieve these improvements?

Person completing this form:

Name _____ Title _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Full-time [ ] Part-time [ ]

FORM 3
Revised
9/7/84

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
PROGRAM EVALUATION SYSTEM

Occupational Education Program Advisory Committee Evaluation Form

NAME OF PROGRAM _____ TOP CODE _____

COLLEGE _____ DATE _____

Background Information

The primary purpose of evaluating occupational education programs and services in the California community college system is to provide a basis for appropriate statewide change and/or program improvement. In addition, evaluation is mandated by both the state and federal governments and consequently it is needed for accountability and compliance purposes. All occupational education programs in California community colleges will be evaluated following a four-year statewide schedule. However, some colleges may choose to conduct additional or more frequent evaluations to meet district needs.

The information you provide by completing the attached evaluation form will be considered by your college administration. Additionally, the evaluation will be held, along with other evaluations of this program, in an accountability file at your college or district offices. Information in the accountability file is intended to be used in the accreditation self-study process in addition to its statewide uses for evaluation and program improvement.

This form is intended to help identify areas of strengths and needs for improvement of the program. Advisory committee responses for each item are intended to describe the effectiveness of the program. The responses are not intended to be used, nor should they be used, to compare this specific program with similar programs at other colleges. When analyzed with similar information about programs at a number of other colleges, the responses will help identify potential strengths and needs for program improvement statewide.

Instructions for Completing the Evaluation Form

1. The chairperson (or his or her designee) and a subcommittee of the total advisory committee may complete this evaluation form, or the chairperson (or designee) may elect to involve the entire committee if circumstances permit.

2. Check each statement which accurately reflects your opinion about or describes the specific occupational education program identified at the beginning of this form.

3. Comments may be given to qualify or clarify any of the answers. Comments should also be used to identify or explain what should be done to improve a situation or condition related to the item.

4. The comment sections may also be used to note any commendations and recommendations the advisory committee may wish to offer regarding the program.

5. The committee chairperson (or designee) who participated in the evaluation should sign the evaluation form.

6. The college administrator immediately responsible for the program will subsequently review the form and will sign this document to indicate that he or she has done so.

If you have any questions, contact the college administrator of occupational education.

CHECK ALL APPROPRIATE STATEMENTS FOR EACH ITEM

1. The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this occupational program:

   |__| a. Are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.

   |__| b. Are for employment at higher than entry level, as specified by employers.

   |__| c. Provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.

   |__| d. Are adequate to provide a quality program.

   |__| e. May be improved by implementing modifications which have been identified by the advisory committee.

   |__| f. Have not recently been reviewed by the advisory committee.

   Comments

   _____

   _____

2. The curriculum for this program:

   |__| a. Contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.

   |__| b. Provides for training to meet current job specifications.

   |__| c. Appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.

   |__| d. May be improved by implementing modifications identify by the advisory committee.

   |__| e. Must be changed if the program is to meet minimum standards for employment specified by employers.

   |__| f. Has not recently been reviewed by the advisory committee.

   Comments

   _____

   _____

3. The equipment and facilities (classrooms, laboratories, etc.) for this program:

   |__| a. Are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.

   |__| b. Are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.

   |__| c. May be improved by implementing modifications identified by the advisory committee.

   |__| d. Must be improved if the program is to meet mininum standards for employment specified by employers.

   |__| e. Will require additional expenditure during each of the next ____ year(s), if the program is to be properly maintained in accordance with the needs of industry.

   |__| f. Have not recently been inspected by the advisory committee.

   Comments

   _____

   _____

4. The annual operational budget for this program, exclusive of capital outlay for equipment and facilities:

   |__| a. Is adequate to provide quality instruction which addresses employers' specifications and needs.

   |__| b. Needs to be augmented or modified to address needs of the program identified by the advisory committee.

   |__| c. Needs to be increased if the program is to be properly maintained in accordance with the needs of industry.

   |__| d. Has not recently been considered by the advisory committee.

   Comments

   _____

   _____

5. Follow-up data about the number of students who complete the program and are employed in a field related to training OR who pursue additional education:

|__| a. Are not available.

|__| b. Have been provided by college staff.

|__| c. Have been reviewed and discussed by the advisory committee.

|__| d. Are inadequate to warrant recommendations.

|__| e. Appear to justify continuing the program, in the opinion of the advisory committee.

|__| f. Seem reasonable, in the opinion of the advisory committee, since student personal goals were met.

|__| g. Suggest the need for program modification, in the opinion of the advisory committee.

Comments

_____

_____

6. Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training OR who pursue additional education:

|__| a. Are not available.

|__| b. Have been provided by college staff.

|__| c. Have been reviewed and discussed by the advisory committee.

|__| d. Are inadequate to warrant recommendations.

|__| e. Appear to justify continuing the program, in the opinion of the advisory committee.

|__| f. Seem reasonable, in the opinion of the advisory committee, since student personal goals were met.

|__| g. Suggest the need for program modification, in the opinion of the advisory committee.

Comments

_____

_____

7. Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, in the opinion of the advisory committee employment demand for persons trained in this program is:

|__| a. Greater than the supply available for employment.

|__| b. Approximately the same as the supply available for employment.

|__| c. Less than the supply available for employment.

|__| d. Supported by a local labor market survey.

|__| e. Unknown.

Comments

_____

_____

8. The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.

|__| a. Yes.

|__| b. No.

|__| c. Don't know.

Comments

_____

_____

9. This program:

- [ ] a. Does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area this program is designed to serve.
- [ ] b. Duplicates a comparable employment training program in the geographic area this program is designed to serve. However, there is justification for this program as it serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
- [ ] c. May unnecessarily duplicate a comparable employment training program in the geographic area this program is designed to serve.

Comments

_____

_____

10. In the opinion of the advisory committee, all of the instructors in this program:

- [ ] a. Have occupational competency to teach the subject.
- [ ] b. Have appropriate employment experience related to the program.
- [ ] c. Possess recent employment experience related to the program.
- [ ] d. Have had recent inservice training opportunities sufficient to meet their needs.
- [ ] e. Have not recently been considered by the advisory committee.

Comments

_____

_____

Advisory committee chairperson (or designee) who participated in the evaluation:

Name _____ Title _____

Signature _____ Date _____

*Please attach a list of all advisory committee members and check those who participated in this evaluation.

College administrator immediately responsible for the program:

Name _____ Title _____

Signature _____ Date _____

College administrator comments, if any:

Appendix D

Results from Occupational Education Administrator Evaluation Form

This appendix shows strengths and needs for improvement for occupational disciplines as perceived by administrators. The following should be noted about the table on the following page:

Off: The number of colleges offering programs in the discipline, as determined from the 1984 Master Plan and Inventory of Programs. About half of them would have been reported in the two years of data collection if all colleges had responded.

Rcd: The number of colleges from which data were received.

Criteria: The Criteria for Quality Programs rated by administrators are shown in the footnote. See Appendix A for a complete description of them.

S: Indicates a strength. A strength was identified when 60% or more of the respondents rated a criterion as "Excellent."

N: Indicates a need for improvement. A need for improvement was identified when 20% or more of the respondents rated a criterion as "Very Poor" or "Poor."

Table D-1

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Occupational Disciplines
As Perceived by Administrators

TOP Discipline	No. of Colleges Off[b]	Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria[a] 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Agriculture & Nat Resources	62	22	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S
Architecture & Environ Design	51	7	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	S
Business & Management	105	40	–	N	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	S
Communications	88	5	–	–	–	S	–	S	S	–	S	–	–	S
Computer & Info Science	97	28	–	N	–	–	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	–
Engineering & Related Tech	104	35	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S
Fine & Applied Arts	51	11	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S
Health	97	34	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S
Consumer Ed & Home Econ	74	27	–	N	–	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	S
Public Affairs & Services	103	27	–	N	–	S	–	S	S	–	S	–	–	S
Commercial Services	68	11	S	–	S	–	–	S	–	–	S	S	S	S

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in this table.

[a]The Criteria for Quality Programs rated by administrators are:

1. Use of Occupational Education Goals
2. Use of Student Follow-up Information
3. Coordination with Other Community Programs and Agencies
4. Special Provisions for Disadvantaged Students
5. Special Provisions for Handicapped Students
6. Special Provisions for Reentry Students
7. Efforts to Achieve Gender Equity
8. Emphasis on Counseling and Guidance
9. Program Availability and Accessibility
10. Promotion of Occupational Education as a Vital College Function
11. Number of Instructors
12. Qualifications of Instructional Staff

[b]Vocational education programs only.

Appendix E

Results from Occupational Education Instructor Evaluation Form

This appendix contains the following tables:

		Page
E-1:	Criteria for Quality Programs Rated by Instructors	66
E-2:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Agriculture/ Natural Resources Programs As Perceived by Instructors	67
E-3:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Distributive and Marketing Programs as Perceived by Instructors	68
E-4:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Health Occupations Programs As Perceived by Instructors	69
E-5:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Home Economics/Consumer Education Programs As Perceived by Instructors	70
E-6:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Office Education/Secretarial Studies Programs As Perceived by Instructors	71
E-7:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Public Safety Education Programs As Perceived by Instructors . . .	72
E-8:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Technical Programs As Perceived by Instructors	73
E-9:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Trade and Industry Programs As Perceived by Instructors	74
E-10:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Instructors: Programs Aggregated by Statewide Advisory Committees Areas	76

The following should be noted about the tables in this appendix:

Off: The number of colleges offering the program, as determined from the 1984 Master Plan and Inventory of Programs. About half of them would have been reported in the two years of data collection if all colleges had responded.

Rcd: The number of colleges from which data were received for the program. It was possible to receive evaluation data for a program when no offerings for that particular occupational program were listed in the Master Plan and Inventory of Programs.

Criteria: The Criteria for Quality Programs rated by instructors. They are listed in Table E-1. See Appendix B for a complete description of them.

S: Indicates a strength. A strength was identified when 60% or more

of the respondents rated a criterion as "Excellent."

N: Indicates a need for improvement. A need for improvement was identified when 20% or more of the respondents rated a criterion as "Very Poor" or "Poor."

Ss and Ns for a program should be interpreted cautiously if only a small number of colleges submitted data for the program. Such a program has a greater chance of having a large number of Ss and Ns simply due to the way the Ss and Ns were determined.

Table E-1

Criteria for Quality Programs Rated by Instructors

No.	Criteria
1	Use of Measurable Program Objectives
2	Use of Measurable Learner Performance Objectives
3	Use of Information on Labor Market and Community Training Needs
4	Use of Info. on Job Performance Requirements and Industry Standards
5	Adaptation of Instructional Approaches
6	Relevance of Major-Related Courses
7	Provision for Work Experience
8	Coordination of Placement of Occupational Education Students
9	Placement Effectiveness for Students Trained with Marketable Skills
10	Provision for Direction and Coordination
11	Qualifications of Administrators and/or Supervisors
12	Number of Instructors
13	Qualifications of Instructional Staff
14	Inservice Education Opportunities
15	Use of Support Staff
16	Adequacy and Availability of Instructional Equipment
17	Adequacy of Instructional Facilities
18	Use of Instructional Facilities and Equipment
19	Adequacy and Availability of Instruc. Materials & Library Resources
20	Use of Advisory Committee
21	Provisions in Current Operating Budget
22	Provisions in Capital Outlay Budget

Note. See the questionnaire in Appendix B for a complete description of the Criteria for Quality Programs.

Table E-2

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Agriculture/Natural Resources Programs
As Perceived by Instructors

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
0100.0	Agriculture/Nat Res	0	4	N	-	-	-	-	S	S	N	-	N	S	N	S	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	N	N
0101.0	Agri/Nat Res, Gen	0	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	N
0101.1	Gen Agriculture	31	4	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	N
0102.0	Agric Production	2	3	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	N
0102.1	Livestock Mgmt	24	3	-	S	-	-	-	N	S	N	-	-	S	-	S	N	-	-	-	S	-	-	N	N
0102.4	Plant Science	23	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N
0102.5	Farm Mgmt	3	0																						
0109.0	Ornamental Horticul	14	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	S	N	N	N	-	-	-	-	N	N
0109.1	Orn Horticul Mgmt	30	6	-	N	N	N	-	-	-	N	-	N	-	-	S	N	N	-	N	-	N	-	-	N
0112.0	Agriculture Serv	2	1	N	N	N	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	S	-	S	-	-	-	S	S	-	S	-	-
0112.1	Agri-Bus Sales/Serv	30	2	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	N	-	-	S	-	S	N	-	N	-	-	-	-	N	N
0112.3	Ag Pest Control Adv	2	1	-	-	N	-	N	N	N	-	S	-	-	-	-	N	S	-	N	-	-	-	N	N
0112.4	Animal Hlth Tec (Lic)	8	2	S	S	-	S	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	-	S	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	N
0112.5	Artif Insemin (Lic)	1	0																						
0112.6	Farrier	1	0																						
0112.7	Animal Groom/Train	1	1	-	-	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	N
0112.8	Food Processing	2	0																						
0114.0	Forestry	15	6	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-
0114.1	Timber Mgmt	3	0																						
0114.2	Forest Protection	2	0																						
0115.0	Natural Resources	2	3	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	N	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	N	N	-
0115.1	Nat Resources Mgmt	13	2	-	S	N	-	-	S	N	N	N	N	N	-	S	N	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	N
0116.0	Ag & Forestry Power	6	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	S	-	S	N	-	-	-	S	-	N
0116.1	Equip & Machin, Gen	5	3	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	N	S	-	N	N	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0116.3	Farm Mechanics	4	1	N	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	N	N
0199.0	Other Agriculture	0	1	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	-	S	-	N	N	-	S	-	S	-	S	S	-	-	-

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

Table E-3

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Distributive and Marketing Programs
As Perceived by Instructors

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
0500.0	Business & Mgmt	0	1	N	S	–	–	S	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	–	N	–	S	–	N	–	–
0501.0	Bus & Commerce, Gen	80	14	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
0506.0	Business Mgmt	83	19	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	S	–	N	–	–	–	–	N	–	N
0506.1	Small Business	9	1	–	–	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
0506.2	Hotel/Motel Mgmt	16	2	–	S	–	–	N	N	N	S	N	N	–	–	S	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	N
0506.3	Mgmt, Devel & Super	54	10	–	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	S	–	S	N	N	–	–	–	–	–	N	–
0506.4	Personnel	3	0																						
0509.0	Marketing & Distrib	56	17	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	N	S	–	–	N	–	–	–	–	N	N
0509.1	Advertising	11	0																						
0509.2	Purchasing	4	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	S	S	–	–
0509.3	Apparel/Accessories	4	2	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
0509.4	Food, Whlsl & Retl	4	0																						
0509.5	Merch (incl Sales)	37	3	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	N	–	S	S	–	S	–	N	N	N	–	–	–	N	N
0509.6	Display	2	1	S	S	–	S	–	S	S	–	S	S	S	–	S	–	N	S	S	–	S	S	–	N
0509.7	Management	5	0																						
0510.0	Transp/Mater Moving	22	3	–	–	S	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	–	–	–	N	S	–	–
0510.1	International Trade	1	0																						
0510.3	Traffic Mgmt	1	0																						
0510.4	Materials Support	1	0																						
0510.5	Airline Ground Crew	1	0																						
0511.0	Real Estate	84	25	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	N	–	–	S	–	S	N	N	–	–	–	–	–	N	N
0512.0	Insurance	16	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	S	–	–	S	S	S	–	S	–	–
0516.0	Labor & Ind Rel	10	2	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	–	–	–	S	N	S	–	–	S	S	S	–	S	N	N
3009.0	Transportation	2	1	S	S	S	S	–	S	N	–	–	S	S	–	S	S	–	S	–	–	S	S	–	–
3009.1	Flight Attendant	7	0																						
3009.3	Travel Agency Oper	7	1	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	–	S	S	–	S	S	S	–	S	–	–
3009.4	Recreation & Tourism	13	0																						

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

Table E-4

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Health Occupations Programs
As Perceived by Instructors

		No. of Programs		Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria																				
		Off	Rcd	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1200.0	Health	0	2	–	S	–	S	S	N	S	–	S	–	–	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	–	–
1202.0	Hosp/Hlth Care Admn	1	0																						
1202.1	Institut Mgmt Techn	6	0																						
1202.2	Hosp Staff Developm	1	0																						
1203.0	Nursing	39	11	S	S	–	S	–	S	S	–	S	–	S	–	S	–	N	–	–	–	–	S	–	–
1203.1	Nursing, RN	36	15	S	–	–	S	–	S	S	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1203.2	Nursing, L.V.N.	56	15	–	S	–	–	–	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	S	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1203.3	Nurses Aide	18	3	–	S	–	S	S	–	S	–	S	–	S	S	S	N	S	–	S	S	–	S	–	–
1203.5	Hospital Ward Clerk	2	1	–	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	–
1203.6	Hosp Central Svc Tech	0	1	–	–	S	–	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	–	S	S	–	–	–	S	S	–	–	–
1203.7	Med Asst & Off Techn	39	15	–	S	–	–	–	S	S	–	S	–	S	N	S	N	N	–	–	S	S	S	–	–
1204.0	Dent Prof/Occ, Gen	3	2	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	–	N	–	S	S	–	–	–	S	S	–	–	–
1204.1	Dental Assistant	31	15	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	–	S	–	S	–	S	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	–	N
1204.2	Dental Hygienist	11	3	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	–	S	–	S	S	S	–	N	S	S	S	–	–	–	–
1204.3	Dental Techn	9	3	–	–	S	S	S	S	N	N	–	S	S	S	S	–	–	–	S	S	–	–	–	–
1205.0	Med Lab Techology	2	0																						
1205.1	Med Lab Tech/BioMed	1	0																						
1205.2	Medical Equip Techn	1	0																						
1205.3	Med Lab Assistant	3	1	S	S	–	–	–	S	–	–	S	–	S	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1206.1	Physicians Asst, Gen	2	0																						
1206.2	Phys Asst,Pediatric	1	0																						
1206.3	Phys Asst,Prim Care	1	1	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	–	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	S
1207.0	Med Specialties,Gen	1	0																						
1207.1	Elect-Diagnos Techy	1	0																						
1207.3	Respiratory Therapy	21	5	–	S	S	–	–	–	S	–	S	–	–	N	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	N
1207.4	Cardio-Pulmon Techn	1	0																						
1207.5	Orthopedic Asst	2	0																						
1207.7	Surg Techn/OR Nursg	1	0																						
1207.8	Dialysis Techn	1	1	S	S	–	–	–	S	S	S	S	–	–	–	S	–	–	S	S	S	–	S	–	–
1208.0	Occup Therapy Techy	5	0																						
1209.0	Optometry, Gen	4	0																						
1209.1	Optical Techn	2	0																						
1211.0	Pharmacy, Gen	4	1	–	S	–	S	S	–	S	S	S	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	S	–	–
1211.1	Pharmacy Techn	5	2	–	–	N	–	–	–	–	N	–	–	S	–	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1211.2	Pharmacy Assistant	1	0																						
1212.0	Physical Therapy	4	1	–	S	S	S	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	–	S	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1212.2	Physical Therapy Asst	3	0																						
1215.0	Med Rcrd Librarship	2	1	–	S	S	S	–	S	S	N	S	–	–	N	–	N	–	–	N	–	–	S	N	–
1215.1	Med Record Techn	7	2	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	–	S	–	–	N	S	–	N	–	S	S	S	S	N	–
1216.0	Podiatry	1	0																						
1220.0	Speech Path/Audiolgy	1	0																						
1225.0	Radiological Techy	24	5	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	N	S	–	S	N	S	N	N	N	N	S	–	S	N	N
1225.1	Nuclr Therapy Techn	3	0																						
1225.2	X-Ray Techn	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	S	–	–	N	–	N	N	N	–	–	–	–	N	–
1225.3	Sonography Techy	1	0																						
1239.0	Psychiatric Tech	15	4	S	S	S	S	–	–	S	N	S	N	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	S	–	S	–	–
1246.0	Recreation Therapy	1	0																						
1250.0	Emergency Med Serv	23	3	–	–	–	S	–	–	S	N	S	–	S	–	S	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1250.1	Paramedical Techn	5	2	–	S	–	–	–	–	S	–	S	–	S	–	S	N	–	S	S	S	S	–	–	–
1250.2	EMT	2	7	–	S	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	S	N	–	–	N	–	S	–	N	N
1255.0	Mortuary Science	1	1	–	–	N	N	–	–	–	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	S	–
2104.3	Comm Health Worker	2	0																						

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

Table E-5

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Home Economics/Consumer Education Programs
As Perceived by Instructors

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
0203.0	Interior Design	15	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	S	-	-	-	N	S	-	-	-	S	-	-
1300.0	Consumer Ed & Hom Ec	0	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1301.0	Consumer Home Educ	61	3[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1302.0	Home Decor & Equip	11	2	S	S	S	S	N	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N
1302.1	Occ Home Furnishing	8	2	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-
1302.2	Floristry	3	0																						
1303.0	Clothing & Textiles	37	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1303.1	Clothing Design	10	1	-	S	S	-	S	S	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-
1303.2	Clothing Merchandis	8	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N
1303.3	Upholstery	2	0																						
1303.4	Industrial Sewing	3	0																						
1304.0	Cons. & HE (Useful)	22	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	N	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1304.1	Cons. & Homemaking	1	0																						
1304.8	Home Management	1	0																						
1305.0	Family Rel/Ch Devel	29	10	-	S	S	S	-	S	S	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	-	-
1305.1	Child Devel & Lab	18	6	-	-	S	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	S	N	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	S	N	-
1305.3	Gerontology	2	0																						
1306.0	Foods & Nutrition	29	4	-	N	-	-	-	N	N	N	S	N	-	-	S	N	-	-	-	N	S	S	N	N
1306.1	Fd Mgmt/Prod Srv/Rel	11	2	-	-	S	S	-	-	S	-	S	N	-	-	S	N	-	N	-	S	S	S	-	N
1306.2	Dietetics	10	1	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	S	S	-	S	-	-	S	S	-	-	-
1306.3	Quantity Food Svcs	1	0																						
1307.0	Institutional Mgmt	9	0																						
2107.0	Human Services	7	2	S	S	S	-	-	S	S	-	S	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	S	S	-	S	-	-
2107.1	Early Child Ed Aide	43	8	N	S	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	N	S	N	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-
2107.2	Child Development	16	1	-	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	N	-	-
2107.3	Parent Ed	4	0																						
2107.4	Gerontology Aide	6	1	S	S	-	-	S	-	S	S	-	S	S	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	S	-	-
2107.5	Ed Aide (Classroom)	64	4	-	S	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2107.6	Recreation Assist	43	3	-	-	S	-	-	N	S	N	S	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	-

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Not considered vocational education so should not have been reported.

Table E-6

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Office Education/Secretarial Studies Programs
As Perceived by Instructors

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
0502.0	Accounting	92	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	N	N
0502.2	Bookkeeping	1	0																						
0502.3	Tax Studies	1	0																						
0504.0	Banking & Finance	64	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-
0504.1	Banking (Mgmt)	5	0																						
0504.2	Invest & Securities	1	0																						
0504.3	Credit Mgmt	3	0																						
0504.4	Cashier/Bank Teller	1	0																						
0514.0	Secr Studies, Gen	103	28	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N
0514.1	Legal	15	1	-	-	N	-	N	-	N	N	N	-	N	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N
0514.2	Medical	10	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0514.3	Court Reporting	4	4	S	S	S	S	-	S	-	S	S	-	S	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	N
0514.4	Administrative	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	S	S	-	-	-	-	-
0514.5	Clerical/Off Pract	74	8	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
0514.6	Typing	24	0																						
0514.7	Word Processing	12	2	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-
1401.1	Legal Asst/Jud Aide	18	1	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

Table E-7

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Public Safety Education Programs
As Perceived by Instructors

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
0808.2	Spec Ed-Serv/Aide	13	2	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	N	-	N	N
2101.0	Community Svcs, Gen	14	1[a]	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	N	-	-	N	-	-	-	-
2101.3	Diving & Underwatr Saf	1	1[a]	S	S	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2101.5	Alcohol & Cont Subs	3	0																						
2102.0	Public Admin	11	0																						
2102.4	Pub Works & Util	1	0																						
2102.5	Street Maintenance	2	0																						
2102.6	Search & Rescue	1	1	-	-	-	S	-	-	N	N	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	-	S	-	-	-	N
2103.0	Parks & Rec Mgmt	12	1	-	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-
2104.0	Soc Wk/Helping Serv	32	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	-
2104.1	Social Work Aide	6	0																						
2105.0	Admin of Justice	91	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	-	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N
2105.1	Corrections	27	1	-	S	N	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	S	S	S	N	N	N
2105.2	Probation & Parole	2	0																						
2105.3	Industrial Security	7	0																						
2105.5	Police Academy	4	0																						
2133.0	Fire Control Techy	45	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	S	N	S	N	-	N	-	-	-	-	N	N
2133.1	Fire & Safety Techn	29	3	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	N	-	S	S	N	S	-	N	N	N	-	-	S	N	N
2133.5	Fire Academy	4	0																						

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Not considered vocational education so should not have been reported.

Table E-8

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Technical Programs
As Perceived by Instructors

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
0201.0	Envir Design, Gen	23	2	N	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	S	N	S	N	-	N	-	S	-	-	N	N
0201.1	Architectural Techy	34	4	S	S	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
0201.2	Urban Planning Techy	4	0																						
0201.3	Architec Model Bldg	1	0																						
0299.0	Other Architecture	1	0																						
0600.0	Communications	0	1[a]	-	-	S	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	-
0601.0	Communications, Gen	30	2[a]	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	S	-	S	-	N
0601.1	Public Relations	2	0																						
0601.2	Technical Writing	1	0																						
0602.0	Journalism	76	1	N	N	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
0603.0	Radio/TV	29	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	S	N	-	N	N	-	-	-	N	N
0603.1	Television Techn	1	0																						
0603.2	Audio/Visual Techn	3	0																						
0604.0	Advertising	3	0																						
0700.0	Computer & Info Sci	0	1	S	S	-	S	-	S	-	N	S	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	N
0701.0	Comput/Info Science	49	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	-
0701.1	Maintenance Techn	5	0																						
0703.0	Data Processing	58	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	N	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	-
0704.0	Computer Programming	20	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	S	N	-	N	N
0704.1	Comp Prog, Business	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	-	N	N	-	-	S	-	-	N	N
0704.2	Comp Prog, Scientific	2	0																						
0705.0	Systems Analysis	6	1	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	-	-
0705.1	Systems Anal, Bus	1	0																						
0925.0	Gen Eng Techy	15	4	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	S	-	-	S	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	S	N	N
0925.1	Civil	10	3	-	S	-	-	S	S	-	-	N	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	N	-
0925.2	Design/Drafting	6	1	-	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	S	S	S	-	-	S	S	S	-	S	-	-
0925.3	Electrical	8	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	N	-	-	-	N	N	N	-	-	-	-	N	N
0925.4	Electronics	32	3	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	N	S	S	S	N	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-
0925.5	Mechanical	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	S	N	N
0925.6	Electromech Techy	1	0																						
0934.0	Tronics/Elect Techy	36	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
0934.1	Electronic Communic	8	2	-	-	S	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0934.2	Industr Electronics	33	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	-
0934.3	Radio/Television	10	2	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	S	S	N	-	-	-	-	-
0934.4	Electrical-Power	10	1	S	S	-	S	S	S	-	-	S	-	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	S	-	S	N	-
0934.5	Electrical-Distrib	1	0																						
0934.6	Computer Electronics	9	1	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	S	S	S	-	-	S	S	-	-	-
0934.7	Electron Microscope	2	0																						
0934.8	Laser Techy	3	1	-	-	S	S	-	S	N	S	S	-	S	-	S	-	N	N	N	-	N	S	N	N
0934.9	Electrical Maint	2	2	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	N	-	N	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
0937.0	Manufacturing Techy	0	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	S	N	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
0937.1	Tool & Mach Design	8	0																						
0943.0	Instrmntation Techy	3	0																						
0943.1	Instrument Maint	1	0																						
0943.2	Bio-Med Instrmntatn	5	0																						
0943.3	Vacuum Techy	1	0																						
0950.0	Aeronaut/Aviat Tech	24	3	S	S	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	N	N	-
0950.1	Airframe	7	2	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-
0950.2	Powerplant	4	1	S	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	-	N	N	-	-	-	N	N	N
0950.3	Commercial Pilot	25	3	-	S	-	S	S	S	N	N	-	-	-	S	S	-	N	N	-	S	-	-	-	-
0950.4	Aircraft Electron	1	0																						
0954.0	Chem Tech Incl Plas	3	1	-	S	S	-	S	S	-	S	S	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-
0954.1	Industr Chemistry	1	0																						
0954.2	Plastics	8	1	-	S	S	S	S	-	S	N	S	-	-	-	S	N	N	N	N	N	-	S	N	N
0954.3	Petroleum	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-
0954.5	Paint	1	0																						
0955.0	Lab Science Tech	3	1	N	N	-	-	N	S	-	-	-	N	N	-	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N
0999.0	Other Engineering	0	1	-	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Not considered vocational education so should not have been reported.

Table E-9

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Trade and Industry Programs
As Perceived by Instructors

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
0930.0	Technol/Occ Curric	7	0																						
0935.0	Electromech Techy	7	1	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
0935.1	Appliance Repair	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	S	-	S	S	S	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N
0935.2	Bus Machine Maint	2	1	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	-	S	S	-	-	S	S	S	-
0935.3	Vending Mach Repair	1	0																						
0935.4	Industr Elect/Mech	3	1	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
0936.0	Print & Lithog, Gen	13	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	N	N	-	-	-	N	N
0936.1	Typeset & Copy Prep	1	0																						
0936.2	Camera & Stripping	1	0																						
0936.4	Press Op Offset/Ltr	2	0																						
0936.5	Bindery & Finish Wk	1	0																						
0945.0	Mechanic Techy, Gen	8	2	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	N	-	N
0945.1	Envir Cont Tech HVAC	14	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	-	N
0945.2	Fluid Pwr/Hydr Techy	2	0																						
0945.3	Stationary Engr Only	1	0																						
0945.4	Refriger Systems	10	4	-	N	-	-	N	S	-	-	S	-	S	-	S	N	-	N	-	-	-	N	N	N
0945.5	Energy Convers Systs	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-
0947.0	Diesel Techy	9	3	N	N	N	N	-	-	N	N	S	N	N	-	-	N	-	-	N	N	-	N	N	N
0947.1	Diesel Mechanic	8	4	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	N	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-
0947.2	Heavy Equip Maint	5	1	-	S	-	S	-	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	S	-	-	-	-	N	N
0947.3	Heavy Equip Oper	2	1	-	-	S	S	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-
0947.4	RR Equip Maint	1	0																						
0948.0	Automotive Techy	33	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	N	-	N	-	-	-	N	N
0948.1	Auto Mechanics	53	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	S	-	N	N	N	-	-	-	N	N
0948.2	Body-Fender	38	10	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	S	N	S	-	N	N	-	N	-	-	-	N
0948.3	Motorcyc/Outbd/Sm E	12	2	-	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	-	S	-	S	S	S	-	-
0952.0	Constr Crafts Techy	11	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	S	S	-	N	N	N	-	-	S	N	N
0952.1	Carpentry	13	6	-	-	N	N	-	N	-	N	-	N	S	N	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	N	N	N
0952.2	Electrical	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0952.3	Plumbing	4	1	-	-	S	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0952.5	Mill & Cabinet Work	8	3	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	-	N	-	N	S	N	S	-	-	-	N	-	-	N
0952.6	Masonry & Plastering	0	3	S	N	N	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	S	S	S	-	S	S	-	S	-	-	-	-
0952.7	Painting & Decoratg	2	1	-	-	-	N	N	N	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0953.0	Drafting Techy	75	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
0953.1	Architectural	8	5	-	-	-	S	S	S	-	S	-	-	S	N	S	-	N	N	N	-	-	-	N	-
0953.2	Civil & Mapping	3	0																						
0953.3	Electrical & Tronic	3	0																						
0953.4	Mechanical	8	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	N	-	N	S	N	N	-	-	S	N	N	N	N
0953.5	Industrial Design	7	0																						
0953.6	Tech Illustration	8	0																						
0956.0	Indust Techy, Gen	35	6	-	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0956.1	Metallurgical Techy	8	1	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	-
0956.2	Metalworking	25	3	-	-	N	S	N	-	S	N	-	-	S	N	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	S	-	N
0956.3	Mach Tool/Mach Shop	30	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	N
0956.4	Sheet Metal	2	2	-	-	N	-	-	-	S	N	-	S	S	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0956.5	Welding & Cutting	44	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
0956.6	Woodworking	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	S	-	N	-	-	S	-	-	N	N
0956.7	Optics	1	0																						
0956.8	Ind Quality Control	15	6	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	-
0956.9	Music Instr Repair	1	0																						
0957.0	Civil/Constr Mgmt	8	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
0957.1	Construction Mgmt	9	3	N	-	N	N	N	-	-	N	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
0957.2	Constrctn Inspection	13	3	S	S	S	S	-	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	N
0957.3	Surveying	20	3	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	S	S	N	N	-	-	-	S	S	N	-
0958.0	Sanit & Publ Health	4	0																						
0958.1	Water & Waste Water	18	4	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	-	-	S	S	-	-	N	-	-	S	S	S	-	-
0958.2	Air Poll Meas/Contr	1	0																						
0958.3	Indust Safety Techn	7	0																						
0958.4	Solid Waste Mgmt	1	0																						
0959.0	Marine Techy	4	1	-	-	-	N	S	S	-	-	-	N	-	S	S	-	-	N	S	S	S	-	N	-
1004.3	Commercial Music	7	0																						
1007.1	Technical Theater	9	0																						
1009.0	Applied Design	0	1	-	S	-	S	N	-	S	-	-	-	N	-	S	-	N	-	-	S	-	S	N	N
1009.2	Commercial Art	15	4	N	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	N	N	N	-	-	N	-	N	N
1010.0	Cinematography	15	0																						

(Table continued on next page)

Table E-9 (Continued)

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Trade and Industry Programs
As Perceived by Instructors

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1011.0	Photography	50	5[a]	-	-	N	N	-	-	N	N	-	-	S	-	S	N	N	-	-	S	-	-	-	-
1011.1	Photo Lab Techn	1	0																						
1011.2	Micrographics	1	0																						
1011.3	Biol Photog Techn	1	0																						
1011.4	Commercial Photog	4	3	-	S	S	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	S	S	S	N	N
1030.0	Graphic Arts	26	4	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N
1030.1	Tech Illustration	4	0																						
3002.0	Food Service Techy	34	1	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	S	S	-	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-
3002.1	Chef Training	2	0																						
3002.2	Institutional Cook	1	1	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-
3002.3	Waiter/Waitress	1	0																						
3002.4	Catering	1	0																						
3002.5	Restaur/Fd Svc Mgmt	3	0																						
3002.6	Baking	1	0																						
3003.0	Leatherworking	2	0																						
3004.0	Instit Housekeeping	1	0																						
3005.0	Custodial Services	2	0																						
3006.0	Barbering	3	0																						
3007.0	Cosmetology	33	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	S	S	-	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	N
3008.0	Drycleaning	1	0																						

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Not considered vocational education so should not have been reported.

Table E-10

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Instructors: Programs Aggregated by Statewide Advisory Committees Areas

Committee Areas	No. of Programs Off[a]	Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Criteria 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Agriculture/Nat Resources	224	59	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N
Distributive & Marketing	533	108	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
Health Occupations	409	125	-	S	-	S	-	S	S	-	S	-	S	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Home Ec/Consumer Ed	413	73	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Office Ed/Secretarial	430	88	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N
Public Safety	290	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
Technical	612	110	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N
Trade & Industry	812	227	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Vocational education programs only.

Appendix F

Results from Occupational Education Program Advisory Committee Evaluation Form

This appendix contains the following tables:

		Page
F-1:	Program Advisory Committee Items Used in the Analyses	79
F-2:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Agriculture/ Natural Resources Programs As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees	81
F-3:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Distributive and Marketing Programs As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees	82
F-4:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Health Occupations Programs As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees	83
F-5:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Home Economics/Consumer Education Programs As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees	84
F-6:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Office Education/Secretarial Studies Programs As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees	85
F-7:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Public Safety Education Programs as Perceived by Local Advisory Committees	86
F-8:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Technical Programs As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees	87
F-9:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Trade and Industry Programs As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees	88
F-10:	Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees: Program Aggregated by Statewide Advisory Committee Areas	90

The following should be noted about the tables in this appendix:

Off: The number of colleges offering the program, as determined from the 1984 Master Plan and Inventory of Programs. About half of them would have been reported in the two years of data collection if all colleges had responded.

Rcd: The number of colleges from which data were received for the program. It was possible to receive evaluation data for a program when no offerings for that particular occupational program were listed in the Master Plan and Inventory of Programs.

Item: The 25 items used in the analyses. They are listed in Table F-1.

The respondent checked an item if it was appropriate for the program being evaluated.

S: Indicates a strength. For each item except 3B, 4C, 5A, and 6A a strength was identified when 60% or more of the respondents checked the item. For items 5A and 6A a strength was identified if 20% or fewer of the respondents checked the item.

N: Indicates a need for improvement. For each item except 3B, 4C, 5A, and 6A a need was identified when 20% or fewer of the respondents checked the item. Item 3B was identified as a need for improvement unless 100% of the respondents checked the item. Items 4C, 5A, and 6A were identified as a need for improvement if 60% or more of the respondents checked the item.

Ss and Ns for a program should be interpreted cautiously if only a small number of colleges submitted data for the program. Such a program has a greater chance of having a large number of Ss and Ns simply due to the way the Ss and Ns were determined.

Table F-1

Program Advisory Committee Items Used in the Analyses

1A.	The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for entry level employment, as specified by employers.
1B.	The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are for employment at higher than entry level, as specified by employers.
1C.	The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program provide for skill development matching industry job specifications.
1D.	The goals (or purposes or objectives) of this program are adequate to provide a quality program.
2A.	The curriculum for this program contains written course outlines which are adequate to provide quality instruction.
2B.	The curriculum for this program provides for training to meet current job specifications.
2C.	The curriculum for this program appears to be designed so that students learn or acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities efficiently.
3A.	The equipment and facilities for this program are adequate to provide quality instruction for the current enrollment served.
3B.	The equipment and facilities for this program are maintained to meet acceptable safety standards.
4A.	The annual operational budget for this program is adequate to provide quality instruction which addresses employers' specifications and needs.
4C.	The annual operational budget for this program needs to be increased if the program is to be properly maintained in accordance with the needs of industry.
5A.	Follow-up data about the number of students who complete the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) are not available.
5C.	Follow-up data about the number of students who complete the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) have been reviewed and discussed by the committee.
5E.	Follow-up data about the number of students who complete the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) appear to justify continuing the program, in the opinion of the committee.
6A.	Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) are not available.

(Table continued on next page)

Table F-1 (continued)

Program Advisory Committee Items Used in the Analyses

6C.	Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) have been reviewed and discussed by the committee.
6E.	Follow-up data about the number of students who leave without completing the program and are employed in a field related to training (or who pursue additional education) appear to justify continuing the program, in the opinion of the advisory committee.
7AB.	Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is greater than or about the same as the supply available for employment.
7D.	Considering the geographic area this program is designed to serve, employment demand for persons trained in this program is supported by a local labor market survey.
8A.	The advisory committee is generally satisfied that the students who complete the requirements of the program are able to perform successfully the competencies required by employers.
9AB.	This program does not duplicate a comparable employment program in the geographic area it is designed to serve, or it duplicates but serves persons who would not otherwise be served.
10A.	All of the instructors in this program have occupational competency to teach the subject.
10B.	All of the instructors in this program have appropriate employment experience related to the program.
10C.	All of the instructors in this program possess recent employment experience related to the program.
10D.	All of the instructors in this program have had recent inservice training opportunities sufficient to meet their needs.

Table F-2

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Agriculture/Natural Resources Programs
As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item 1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
0100.0	Agriculture/Nat Res	0	2	S	N	–	S	–	–	S	S	N	N	–	–	–	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	–	N	N
0101.0	Agri/Nat Res, Gen	0	1	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N	–	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0101.1	Gen Agriculture	31	2	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	N	N	S	N	–	S	–	–	–	–
0102.0	Agric Production	2	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
0102.1	Livestock Mgmt	24	4	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	N	–	–	–	N	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
0102.4	Plant Science	23	4	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	S	–	–	S	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
0102.5	Farm Mgmt	3	0																									
0109.0	Ornamental Horticul	14	11	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	S	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
0109.1	Orn Horticul Mgmt	30	6	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	–	N	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	–
0112.0	Agriculture Serv	2	3	–	–	S	S	–	–	S	S	N	–	–	–	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	–	–	–
0112.1	Agri-Bus Sales/Serv	30	3	S	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	S	S	S	S	–	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
0112.3	Ag Pest Control Adv	2	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0112.4	Animal Hlth Tec (Lic)	8	2	S	–	–	S	S	S	S	–	N	–	–	S	–	–	S	–	–	–	N	–	S	S	S	–	–
0112.5	Artif Insemin (Lic)	1	0																									
0112.6	Farrier	1	0																									
0112.7	Animal Groom/Train	1	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
0112.8	Food Processing	2	0																									
0114.0	Forestry	15	5	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	–	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	–	S
0114.1	Timber Mgmt	3	0																									
0114.2	Forest Protection	2	0																									
0115.0	Natural Resources	2	3	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	–	–	N	S	S	S	S	N	S
0115.1	Nat Resources Mgmt	13	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	–	S	S	–	N	N
0116.0	Ag & Forestry Power	6	3	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	S	–	N	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	S
0116.1	Equip & Machin, Gen	5	2	S	–	–	–	S	–	–	S	N	–	–	S	–	–	–	N	N	N	N	–	S	S	S	S	–
0116.3	Farm Mechanics	4	1	N	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
0199.0	Other Agriculture	0	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

Table F-3

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Distributive and Marketing Programs
As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Acd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item 1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
0500.0	Business & Mgmt	0	2	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	S	-	-	-	N	N	N	-	-	S	-	-	N	-
0501.0	Bus & Commerce, Gen	80	9	S	-	S	-	-	S	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	-	-	N	N
0506.0	Business Mgmt	83	15	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	-	-	N
0506.1	Small Business	9	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	S	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0506.2	Hotel/Motel Mgmt	16	3	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
0506.3	Mgmt, Devel & Super	54	8	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	N
0506.4	Personnel	3	0																									
0509.0	Marketing & Distrib	56	12	S	-	S	-	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0509.1	Advertising	11	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0509.2	Purchasing	4	2	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	S	N	-	-	S	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	S	S	S	-	-	N
0509.3	Apparel/Accessories	4	1	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	-	S	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	N	N	N	N
0509.4	Food, Whlsl & Retl	4	0																									
0509.5	Merch (incl Sales)	37	3	S	N	S	-	S	S	S	-	N	N	N	S	S	S	-	S	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	N	N
0509.6	Display	2	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N
0509.7	Management	5	0																									
0510.0	Transp/Water Moving	22	3	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
0510.1	International Trade	1	0																									
0510.3	Traffic Mgmt	1	0																									
0510.4	Materials Support	1	0																									
0510.5	Airline Ground Crew	1	0																									
0511.0	Real Estate	84	20	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
0512.0	Insurance	16	4	-	S	S	N	S	-	S	S	N	S	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	-	-	-
0516.0	Labor & Ind Rel	10	2	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
3009.0	Transportation	2	1	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	N	N	N	N
3009.1	Flight Attendant	7	0																									
3009.3	Travel Agency Oper	7	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
3009.4	Recreation & Tourism	13	0																									

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

Table F-4

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Health Occupations Programs
As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
				Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item																								
1200.0	Health	0	1	N	N	S	N	N	N	S	S	N	N	–	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	N	N	N	N
1201.0	Health Professns, Gen	10	1[a]	S	N	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	N	N	N
1202.0	Hosp/Hlth Care Admn	1	0																									
1202.1	Institut Mgmt Techn	6	0																									
1202.2	Hosp Staff Developm	1	0																									
1203.0	Nursing	39	8	S	N	–	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	S	S	S	–	N	N	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S
1203.1	Nursing, RN	36	14	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	–	–	S	S	–	–	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
1203.2	Nursing, L.V.N.	56	11	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	–	–	–
1203.3	Nurses Aide	18	2	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	N	N	S	N	N	N	N	–	S	S	–	–	–
1203.5	Hospital Ward Clerk	2	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
1203.6	Hosp Central Svc Tech	0	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
1203.7	Med Asst & Off Techn	39	13	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	–	S	–	S	S	S	S	–	S
1204.0	Dent Prof/Occ, Gen	3	2	S	N	–	S	S	S	S	–	N	N	–	S	–	–	S	N	N	–	N	S	S	S	S	–	N
1204.1	Dental Assistant	31	13	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	–	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	–
1204.2	Dental Hygienist	11	3	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	–
1204.3	Dental Techn	9	2	S	N	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
1205.0	Med Lab Techology	2	0																									
1205.1	Med Lab Tech/BioMed	1	0																									
1205.2	Medical Equip Techn	1	0																									
1205.3	Med Lab Assistant	3	0																									
1206.1	Physicians Asst,Gen	2	0																									
1206.2	Phys Asst,Pediatric	1	0																									
1206.3	Phys Asst,Prim Care	1	0																									
1207.0	Med Specialties,Gen	1	0																									
1207.1	Elect-Diagnos Techy	1	0																									
1207.3	Respiratory Therapy	21	6	–	–	S	–	S	S	–	S	N	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	–
1207.4	Cardio-Pulmon Techn	1	0																									
1207.5	Orthopedic Asst	2	0																									
1207.7	Surg Techn/OR Nursg	1	0																									
1207.8	Dialysis Techn	1	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
1208.0	Occup Therapy Techy	5	0																									
1209.0	Optometry, Gen	4	0																									
1209.1	Optical Techn	2	0																									
1211.0	Pharmacy, Gen	4	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
1211.1	Pharmacy Techn	5	2	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	–	N	N	–	–	–	–	S	–	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	–
1211.2	Pharmacy Assistant	1	0																									
1212.0	Physical Therapy	4	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
1212.2	Physical Therapy Asst	3	0																									
1215.0	Med Rcrd Librarship	2	1	S	N	S	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	–	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	N	S	N	N	N	N	N
1215.1	Med Record Techn	7	2	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	–	S	S	S	–	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	–	N	–
1216.0	Podiatry	1	0																									
1220.0	Speech Path/Audiolgy	1	0																									
1225.0	Radiological Techy	24	6	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
1225.1	Nuclr Therapy Techn	3	0																									
1225.2	X-Ray Techn	2	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
1225.3	Sonography Techy	1	0																									
1239.0	Psychiatric Tech	15	6	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	–	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
1246.0	Recreation Therapy	1	0																									
1250.0	Emergency Med Serv	23	4	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	S	S	N	N	N	N	–	S	S	S	S	–	–
1250.1	Paramedical Techn	5	1	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
1250.2	EMT	2	5	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	–	S	S	N	N	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
1255.0	Mortuary Science	1	1	S	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
2104.3	Comm Health Worker	2	0																									

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Not considered vocational education so should not have been reported.

Table F-5

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Home Economics/Consumer Education Programs
As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item: 1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
0203.0	Interior Design	15	1	N	N	S	S	N	N	S	S	N	N	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	N	S	S
1300.0	Consumer Ed & Hom Ec	0	2	S	S	–	–	S	–	S	–	N	N	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	N	S	S	S	S	S	–
1301.0	Consumer Home Educ	61	3[a]	–	–	S	S	S	–	S	S	N	–	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	S	S	–
1302.0	Home Decor & Equip	11	2	S	N	S	N	S	–	–	N	S	–	–	–	–	–	N	N	N	–	N	–	S	N	N	N	N
1302.1	Occ Home Furnishing	8	2	S	–	–	S	S	–	S	–	N	N	–	S	S	S	S	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	–	–	S
1302.2	Floristry	3	0																									
1303.0	Clothing & Textiles	37	12	S	–	S	S	S	–	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	–	–	N
1303.1	Clothing Design	10	1	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
1303.2	Clothing Merchandis	8	3	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	N	S	–	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N
1303.3	Upholstery	2	0																									
1303.4	Industrial Sewing	3	0																									
1304.0	Cons. & HE (Useful)	22	4	–	–	–	–	S	–	S	S	S	–	–	–	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	–	N	N
1304.1	Cons. & Homemaking	1	0																									
1304.8	Home Management	1	0																									
1305.0	Family Rel/Ch Devel	29	5	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	–	N	N	–	–	S	S	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	–	N	N
1305.1	Child Devel & Lab	18	4	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	–	S	S	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	S	–	S
1305.3	Gerontology	2	1	N	N	N	S	S	N	S	S	S	N	–	S	S	S	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	N	N	N
1306.0	Foods & Nutrition	29	4	S	–	–	–	S	S	S	S	N	N	–	–	–	–	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	–	S	–	N
1306.1	Fd Mgmt/Prod Srv/Rel	11	2	S	S	–	–	S	S	S	–	N	–	–	S	–	–	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	–	–	–	–
1306.2	Dietetics	10	1	S	N	S	N	S	N	S	S	S	N	–	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
1306.3	Quantity Food Svcs	1	0																									
1307.0	Institutional Mgmt	9	0																									
2107.0	Human Services	7	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
2107.1	Early Child Ed Aide	43	5	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	–	–	N	–	–	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
2107.2	Child Development	16	2	S	S	–	S	S	–	S	S	S	N	–	–	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	–	–	–
2107.3	Parent Ed	4	0																									
2107.4	Gerontology Aide	6	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N
2107.5	Ed Aide (Classroom)	64	3	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	S	S	S	S	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
2107.6	Recreation Assist	43	3	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	–	N	S	S	S	S	N	N

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Not considered vocational education so should not have been reported.

Table F-6

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Office Education/Secretarial Studies Programs
As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item 1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
0502.0	Accounting	92	22	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	N
0502.2	Bookkeeping	1	0																									
0502.3	Tax Studies	1	0																									
0504.0	Banking & Finance	64	13	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	S	S	S	–	–	N
0504.1	Banking (Mgmt)	5	0																									
0504.2	Invest & Securities	1	0																									
0504.3	Credit Mgmt	3	0																									
0504.4	Cashier/Bank Teller	1	0																									
0514.0	Secr Studies, Gen	103	21	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
0514.1	Legal	15	2	S	N	S	N	S	S	–	–	N	S	–	–	–	–	N	N	N	–	N	S	–	–	–	–	–
0514.2	Medical	10	2	S	N	N	N	–	N	S	N	N	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	S	–	N	N
0514.3	Court Reporting	4	4	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	N
0514.4	Administrative	2	0																									
0514.5	Clerical/Off Pract	74	5	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	N	N	N	–	–	S	N	–	–	S	–	S	S	S	S	N	N
0514.6	Typing	24	0																									
0514.7	Word Processing	12	2	–	–	S	–	S	S	–	–	S	N	–	–	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	–	N	N
1401.1	Legal Asst/Jud Aide	18	0																									

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

Table F-7

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Public Safety Education Programs
As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
				Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item																								
0808.2	Spec Ed-Serv/Aide	13	3	S	–	–	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
2101.0	Community Svcs, Gen	14	1[a]	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	N	N	N	N
2101.5	Alcohol & Cont Subs	3	0																									
2102.0	Public Admin	11	0																									
2102.4	Pub Works & Util	1	0																									
2102.5	Street Maintenance	2	0																									
2102.6	Search & Rescue	1	1	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	N
2103.0	Parks & Rec Mgmt	12	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
2104.0	Soc Wk/Helping Serv	32	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
2104.1	Social Work Aide	6	1	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
2105.0	Admin of Justice	91	20	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
2105.1	Corrections	27	1	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	S	N	N	N	N
2105.2	Probation & Parole	2	0																									
2105.3	Industrial Security	7	0																									
2105.5	Police Academy	4	0																									
2133.0	Fire Control Techy	45	10	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	–	N	–	N	S	S	S	–	–	–	–	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
2133.1	Fire & Safety Techn	29	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	S	N	N	–	–	–	S	N	–	–	–	N	S	S	S	S	S	–
2133.5	Fire Academy	4	0																									

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Not considered vocational education so should not have been reported.

Table F-8

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Technical Programs
As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
				Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item																								
0201.0	Envir Design, Gen	23	2	-	N	S	S	-	-	S	-	N	N	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	-	-	N
0201.1	Architectural Techy	34	5	S	-	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	-	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0201.2	Urban Planning Techy	4	0																									
0201.3	Architec Model Bldg	1	0																									
0299.0	Other Architecture	1	0																									
0601.0	Communications, Gen	30	2[a]	S	N	-	N	-	-	N	N	N	N	-	S	-	-	S	-	N	-	N	-	S	S	S	-	N
0601.1	Public Relations	2	0																									
0601.2	Technical Writing	1	0																									
0602.0	Journalism	76	0																									
0603.0	Radio/TV	29	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	N	N	N
0603.1	Television Techn	1	0																									
0603.2	Audio/Visual Techn	3	0																									
0604.0	Advertising	3	0																									
0700.0	Computer & Info Sci	0	1	S	N	S	N	S	S	S	N	S	N	-	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	N	N	N
0701.0	Comput/Info Science	49	7	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0701.1	Maintenance Techn	5	0																									
0703.0	Data Processing	58	10	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0704.0	Computer Programming	20	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	-	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
0704.1	Comp Prog, Business	5	3	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	N	-	-	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	-	-	-	N
0704.2	Comp Prog, Scientific	2	0																									
0705.0	Systems Analysis	6	0																									
0705.1	Systems Anal, Bus	1	0																									
0925.0	Gen Eng Techy	15	4	S	-	-	-	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	-
0925.1	Civil	10	2	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	-	-	-	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
0925.2	Design/Drafting	6	0																									
0925.3	Electrical	8	0																									
0925.4	Electronics	32	4	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	-	N	-	-	-	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	-
0925.5	Mechanical	5	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
0925.6	Electromech Techy	1	0																									
0934.0	Tronics/Elect Techy	36	15	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	N	S	-	-	-	-	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0934.1	Electronic Communic	8	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N
0934.2	Industr Electronics	33	4	S	-	S	-	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0934.3	Radio/Television	10	0																									
0934.4	Electrical-Power	10	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0934.5	Electrical-Distrib	1	0																									
0934.6	Computer Electronics	9	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N
0934.7	Electron Microscope	2	0																									
0934.8	Laser Techy	3	2	-	N	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	-	-	S	S	S	S	-	-	S	-	S	S	S	S	-	-
0934.9	Electrical Maint	2	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N
0937.0	Manufacturing Techy	0	2	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	-
0937.1	Tool & Mach Design	8	0																									
0943.0	Instrmntation Techy	3	0																									
0943.1	Instrument Maint	1	0																									
0943.2	Bio-Med Instrmntatn	5	0																									
0943.3	Vacuum Techy	1	0																									
0950.0	Aeronaut/Aviat Tech	24	2	-	N	S	-	S	-	S	-	N	N	-	S	-	-	-	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0950.1	Airframe	7	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0950.2	Powerplant	4	0																									
0950.3	Commercial Pilot	25	3	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	S	-	-	-	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	-
0950.4	Aircraft Electron	1	0																									
0954.0	Chem Tech Incl Plas	3	0																									
0954.1	Industr Chemistry	1	0																									
0954.2	Plastics	8	1	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	N	N	N
0954.3	Petroleum	2	1	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
0954.5	Paint	1	0																									
0955.0	Lab Science Tech	3	0																									
0999.0	Other Engineering	0	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	N	-	S	S	S	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Not considered vocational education so should not have been reported.

Table F-9

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Trade and Industry Programs
As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
				Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item																								
0930.0	Technol/Occ Curric	7	0																									
0935.0	Electromech Techy	7	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
0935.1	Appliance Repair	5	0																									
0935.2	Bus Machine Maint	2	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	N	S	S	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
0935.3	Vending Mach Repair	1	0																									
0935.4	Industr Elect/Mech	3	0																									
0936.0	Print & Lithog, Gen	13	4	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0936.1	Typeset & Copy Prep	1	0																									
0936.2	Camera & Stripping	1	0																									
0936.4	Press Op Offset/Ltr	2	0																									
0936.5	Bindery & Finish Wk	1	0																									
0945.0	Mechanic Techy, Gen	8	4	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	-	-	N
0945.1	Envir Cont Tech HVAC	14	4	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0945.2	Fluid Pwr/Hydr Techy	2	0																									
0945.3	Stationary Engr Only	1	0																									
0945.4	Refriger Systems	10	4	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	N	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	S	-	S	-	-
0945.5	Energy Convers Systs	4	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	N	S	N
0947.0	Diesel Techy	9	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0947.1	Diesel Mechanic	8	3	S	S	-	N	-	S	-	S	N	-	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	-
0947.2	Heavy Equip Maint	5	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0947.3	Heavy Equip Oper	2	1	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
0947.4	RR Equip Maint	1	0																									
0948.0	Automotive Techy	33	10	S	S	-	-	S	S	S	S	N	N	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	-
0948.1	Auto Mechanics	53	8	S	N	S	-	S	-	S	S	N	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0948.2	Body-Fender	38	6	S	-	-	N	S	-	N	-	N	-	-	S	-	-	-	N	N	-	N	S	S	S	S	-	N
0948.3	Motorcyc/Outbd/Sm E	12	2	S	-	S	S	-	S	-	S	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	N	-	N	S	S	S	S	-	S
0952.0	Constr Crafts Techy	11	7	S	-	S	-	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0952.1	Carpentry	13	4	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	-
0952.2	Electrical	2	3	S	-	S	-	S	-	S	S	N	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	-	S	S	S	-	-	-
0952.3	Plumbing	4	1	N	N	S	N	S	N	N	N	N	N	-	S	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	N	N	N	N	N
0952.5	Mill & Cabinet Work	8	2	S	N	S	-	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	N	S	S	S	S	S	-
0952.6	Masonry & Plastering	0	2	-	N	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	S	S	S	-	-	-	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	-
0952.7	Painting & Decoratg	2	0																									
0953.0	Drafting Techy	75	15	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	-	-	-
0953.1	Architectural	8	4	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	N	-	-	S	S	S	-	S	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0953.2	Civil & Mapping	3	0																									
0953.3	Electrical & Tronic	3	0																									
0953.4	Mechanical	8	1	S	S	S	N	S	S	N	S	N	N	-	S	S	S	S	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	N	N
0953.5	Industrial Design	7	0																									
0953.6	Tech Illustration	8	0																									
0956.0	Indust Techy, Gen	35	6	S	-	-	-	S	-	S	S	S	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	-	S	-
0956.1	Metallurgical Techy	8	1	S	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	N	N	-	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0956.2	Metalworking	25	3	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	S	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	-
0956.3	Mach Tool/Mach Shop	30	8	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	N	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
0956.4	Sheet Metal	2	2	-	N	-	N	-	S	N	N	N	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	S	N	S	S	S	N	N	N
0956.5	Welding & Cutting	44	14	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0956.6	Woodworking	3	0																									
0956.7	Optics	1	0																									
0956.8	Ind Quality Control	15	3	S	S	S	-	S	S	-	S	N	S	-	S	S	-	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	N
0956.9	Music Instr Repair	1	0																									
0957.0	Civil/Constr Mgmt	8	5	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	-
0957.1	Construction Mgmt	9	2	S	N	N	N	N	-	N	-	N	N	-	-	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	N	N	N
0957.2	Constrctn Inspection	13	3	S	-	S	S	S	-	S	-	S	S	-	-	-	-	N	N	N	-	N	S	S	S	S	-	-
0957.3	Surveying	20	2	S	-	S	-	-	S	S	S	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	S	S	S	S	-	N
0958.0	Sanit & Publ Health	4	0																									
0958.1	Water & Waste Water	18	4	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	-
0958.2	Air Poll Meas/Contr	1	0																									
0958.3	Indust Safety Techn	7	0																									
0958.4	Solid Waste Mgmt	1	0																									
0959.0	Marine Techy	4	0																									
1004.3	Commercial Music	7	0																									
1007.1	Technical Theater	9	0																									
1009.0	Applied Design	0	1	S	N	S	S	N	S	S	N	N	N	N	S	S	N	S	S	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	N	N
1009.2	Commercial Art	15	2	S	-	-	S	-	-	S	-	N	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	S	S	N
1010.0	Cinematography	15	0																									

(Table continued on next page)

Table F-9 (Continued)

Strengths and Needs for Improvement for Trade and Industry Programs
As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees

Code	Program Title	No. of Programs Off	No. of Programs Rcd	1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
				Strength (S) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item																								
1011.0	Photography	50	5[a]	S	N	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
1011.1	Photo Lab Techn	1	0																									
1011.2	Micrographics	1	0																									
1011.3	Biol Photog Techn	1	0																									
1011.4	Commercial Photog	4	1	S	N	S	N	S	S	S	N	S	N	N	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S
1030.0	Graphic Arts	26	3	S	S	S	N	–	S	S	S	N	N	–	S	–	–	–	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	N
1030.1	Tech Illustration	4	0																									
3002.0	Food Service Techy	34	1	N	S	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	N	–	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	S	S	N	N	N
3002.1	Chef Training	2	0																									
3002.2	Institutional Cook	1	1	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	N	N	S	N	N	N	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
3002.3	Waiter/Waitress	1	0																									
3002.4	Catering	1	0																									
3002.5	Restaur/Fd Svc Mgmt	3	0																									
3002.6	Baking	1	0																									
3003.0	Leatherworking	2	0																									
3004.0	Instit Housekeeping	1	0																									
3005.0	Custodial Services	2	0																									
3006.0	Barbering	3	0																									
3007.0	Cosmetology	33	6	S	–	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	–	S	–	–	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	–
3008.0	Drycleaning	1	0																									

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Not considered vocational education so should not have been reported.

Table F-10

Strengths and Needs for Improvement As Perceived by Local Advisory Committees: Programs Aggregated by Statewide Advisory Committee Areas

Committee Area	No. of Programs Off[a]	No. of Programs Rcd	1 A	1 B	1 C	1 D	2 A	2 B	2 C	3 A	3 B	4 A	4 C	5 A	5 C	5 E	6 A	6 C	6 E	7 AB	7 D	8 A	9 AB	10 A	10 B	10 C	10 D
	Strength(s) or Need for Improvement (N) for Item																										
Agriculture/Nat Resources	224	58	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
Distributive & Marketing	533	89	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
Health Occupations	409	110	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	S	–	S	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
Home Ec/Consumer Ed	413	62	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
Office/Secretarial	430	71	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	N
Public Safety	290	43	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	N	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–
Technical	612	79	S	–	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	S	–
Trade & Industry	812	163	S	–	S	–	S	S	S	S	N	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	S	N	S	S	S	S	–	–

Note. See beginning of appendix for explanation of terms used in the table.

[a]Vocational education programs only.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges SEP 02 1988